

THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME X
NUMBER 5

MAY, 1902

WHOLE
NUMBER 95

THE UNDERGRADUATE STUDY OF ENGLISH COMPOSITION.¹

A YEAR ago the Pedagogical Section of the Modern Language Association investigated the question as to the feasibility of making advanced work in rhetoric (using that term in the broadest sense) a part of graduate university work counting toward a degree. The report read at the December meeting of last year has just been printed. This year the investigation has been carried a step lower down, and has endeavored to test the opinions of competent judges on the question whether the methods of teaching composition now so widely followed are beyond the reach of criticism.

With this in view the committee selected, from a brief article in the *Century Magazine*, a passage representing an attitude of extreme hostility to the plan of compelling students to write frequent themes, which should be corrected and returned to the writers.

The passage runs as follows:

A wide reader is usually a correct writer; and he has reached the goal in the most delightful manner, without feeling the penalty of Adam. . . . We would not take the extreme position taken by some, that all practice in theme-writing is time thrown away; but after a costly experience of the drudgery that composition work forces on teacher and pupil, we would say

¹ *Report of the Pedagogical Section*, read at the meeting of the Modern Language Association at Harvard University, December 26, 1901.

emphatically that there is no educational method at present that involves so enormous an outlay of time, energy, and money, with so correspondingly small a result. . . . In order to support this with evidence, let us take the experience of a specialist who investigated the question by reading many hundred sophomore compositions in two of our leading colleges, where the natural capacity and previous training of the students were fairly equal. In one college every freshman wrote themes steadily through the year, with an accompaniment of sound instruction in rhetorical principles; *in the other college every freshman studied Shakspeare, with absolutely no training in rhetoric and with no practice in composition. A comparison of the themes written in their sophomore year by these students showed that technically the two were fully on a par.* That is weighty and most significant testimony.—*The Century Magazine* (Vol. LI, pp. 793, 794).

Comments were requested on the question raised by this quotation. Details of similar experiments, if known, were called for. And, finally, the question was raised as to the possibility of conducting an experiment, or a series of experiments, which should furnish conclusive proof of the value, or the futility, of requiring freshmen to write themes steadily through the year.¹

The reports that came back in response to these inquiries varied in length from a line or less to elaborate discussions which filled several pages. Taken as a whole, they may be regarded as fairly representative of the present position of college and university teachers of English throughout the country as to the relative importance of reading and theme writing. Harvard University, Yale, Columbia, Cornell, the Universities of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Chicago, Leland Stanford Jr., Johns Hopkins, Louisiana, and many other institutions have had a voice in the discussion.

Our report naturally divides itself into three parts: (1) A summary of opinions on the question raised by the quotation; (2) an account of experiments similar to that just outlined; (3) a discussion of methods for determining with some accuracy the relative value of reading and practical work in composition.

So much depends in this investigation upon the experiments that we are naturally most curious to learn whether this question has been very generally tested. I therefore take up the second

¹ The circulars of inquiry were issued under the direction of Professor F. N. Scott, of Michigan University, the president of the Pedagogical Section.

division first. Unfortunately, most of those who answered the questions in the circular of inquiry knew of no other such experiments. Some teachers thought they had tested the matter by noting that students in their classes in composition wrote better at the end of a course than at the beginning, or by observing that the winners of prizes for literary work in the various college publications were almost without exception students who had had systematic training in composition.

One professor of rhetoric² holds that he has proved the falsity of the position taken in the quotation, and he sends on a printed collection of unedited college themes, which he offers to compare with a collection of articles written by college undergraduates who have not had drill in theme-writing. One instructor had been led to the conclusion in his own classes that the most omnivorous readers are often careless writers, because they write as they read, without much thought.

We have, however, a few accounts of positive experiments. One of our pedagogical psychologists writes:

I am getting short themes written in class from high schools in different parts of the country, with the intention of comparing the quality of the work with the nature of the instruction given. In some cases there is regular theme-writing, in others not. In some cases there is much required reading of English classics, in others little.

The results of his work are not yet tabulated, but they ought to be of considerable importance, if sufficient safeguards are employed.

The next witness has experimented only upon himself, but he has had "some convincing personal experience." He says:

I have published several books on the subject of rhetoric, and I considered myself fairly expert in the art of composition, besides trying to cultivate a sense of style. I never had instruction, but obtained whatever proficiency I had from reading and the teaching of composition. Last summer I was printing a book on a literary subject, and the proof-sheets passed through the hands of a friend who is also a teacher of rhetoric. Scarcely a paragraph or sentence was left as originally written. 'I trembled for the result of such

² For a variety of reasons it has been thought desirable to suppress the names of the writers of the individual reports and to allow the opinions and facts to speak for themselves. Much care has been taken to secure a really representative expression of opinion. Names will, however, be furnished on application.

anxious revision. But now the book has been said, by several competent judges, to be written in a pleasing and unaffected style! I honestly believe that this practical instruction I obtained has yielded certain and important results which my reading never has yielded and never can yield. This case is not quite parallel to a student's case, but, as being in the nature of expert testimony, should be worth something.

The three following are the only reported experiments similar to the one mentioned in the quotation; and these must be confessed to be not altogether conclusive. Says one:

I have tried a similar experiment twice, for a period of three months. I found that the study of Shakspeare influenced the vocabulary of many students the next quarter, but did not affect their prose style otherwise.

A Harvard instructor writes:

The only experiment of the kind I know of was in the comparison of a certain number of papers written in a course in literature at Yale College with a number of similar papers written in a similar course at Harvard. Of three or four of our men here who examined the papers, all but one agreed that the papers written at Harvard were better written, and showed the result of the time given to English composition.

This is presumably the experiment described in our quotation.

Lastly, we have the following:

In one of our eastern colleges, about two years ago, the course in rhetoric and theme-writing was transferred from the sophomore to the freshman year. As a consequence, the sophomores had no course in rhetoric and theme-writing during the first year of the new plan. Nevertheless their writing showed in the junior year no important difference from that of the succeeding junior class. Having myself read the essays of both classes, I may affirm that a slight improvement in sentence-structure, and a little more freedom from glaring faults of taste and method, were the only noticeable distinctions. I fail to see that the later class commanded a style a whit more resourceful or effective. In short, the result was negative, not positive. And I venture to say that this negative result—of mechanical correctness, not real correctness—is all that is obtained in teaching unread students in any college of the United States.

Some sympathy with the conclusions of the writer of the paper in the *Century* is expressed in several of the reports; but, taken as a whole, the reports reveal a pretty general skepticism concerning the conclusiveness of the experiment therein described. One experiment, it is urged, is not enough to establish a conclusion so far-reaching in its results.

Evidently, after this showing, anyone who is seeking an unclaimed subject for investigation has a well-nigh virgin field to work in. This leads us to a discussion of the possibility of settling the question by experiment. A considerable number of teachers hold that the matter lies outside the range of conclusive experiment, owing to the difficulty of taking all the factors into consideration, and one volunteers the opinion that pedagogy is running mad and needs an infusion of common-sense. Some think experiments to be possible, but very undesirable for the students.

We do not [says one] tie up a student's arm and then read him anatomy; we exercise the arm. We have no business to tie up his writing-hand for a year and expect him to absorb technique of any sort through the skin.

One suggests a test course, half of a large class doing writing, and the other half receiving instruction in literature, the experiment to be continued for two years. To another such an experiment seems possible at a very large institution, but too risky for a small one. Some think the case for composition already made out, and the experiment therefore needless. "Experiments to determine whether freshmen should profit by practice in composition are futile, but experiments to ascertain suitable methods of instruction should prove of the highest value." "Results," however, "cannot be obtained by a condensed report of many opinions where all are at sea, but through an investigation of the essential principles and conditions of effective work."

Many of the suggestions go no further than to propose the division of a class into sections. One section of freshmen could be admitted immediately to a required course in English literature without a prerequisite course in composition. At the close of the year these freshmen could be tested and the results compared with the written work of the freshmen who had taken the prescribed course in composition. But this plan, it is urged, would interrupt the regular course of instruction and be unadvisable, because the results would necessarily be uncertain and unscientific.

A more elaborate scheme, but adopting essentially the same method, is the following :

Take a freshman class of a hundred or more students. Let this class be conducted for a few weeks as a class in English literature, and let the study be of poetry rather than of prose, which might serve as a model. Call for weekly short papers and for one or two essays in which emphasis is laid upon thought, not upon form. Upon the information thus obtained, divide the class as soon as possible (in two months at the outside, sooner if practicable) into four sections, A, B, C, and D. Let sections A and B contain the upper half of the class—better still, the upper third, or even the upper quarter—the grading to be based solely upon the work in this single subject up to the time of the division of the class.

Let Section A study English literature (prose and poetry) during the rest of the academic year; let Section B study rhetoric. At the end of the year it will probably be found that there is little difference between the members of the two sections as regards skill in writing. Each section will furnish some of the best writers in the class.

Let Sections C and D (the lower half, or, better still, the lower two-thirds or three-quarters of the class) be treated in the same way. Let Section C study English literature; let Section D study rhetoric. At the end of the year it will probably be found that there is a marked difference between the members of the two sections as regards skill in writing. A few members of Section C will write as well as those in Section D, perhaps, even, as well as the average members of Section A or Section B: there must inevitably be some mistakes in grading. The members of Section D (rhetoric) will, however, write with more accuracy, with more freedom from the faults that abound in the manuscript of nearly all students who have not received special instruction in English composition. Especially will this be true if the members of Section D have been required to do some reading of good prose in connection with their study of rhetoric. My own classes are required to make an analytic study of nineteenth-century prose in connection with their study of rhetoric.

A suggestion that might be adopted without too great an expenditure of time, and without interfering with the work of students, is the following:

It is proposed that a collation be made of the data to be found in the registrar's offices in our colleges and universities with reference to the influence of various lines of study upon the use of English. "I now have several people at work," says the writer, "upon the data in the office of the registrar in our own university, with the end in view to see if I can get any evidence relating to the effect of classical and other fields of special study upon the appreciation and writing of English. I am taking the records for a number of years of students in the different courses and comparing these with reference to their grades in English to see if the figures reveal anything. Of course there

are difficulties of a serious character surrounding the investigation, since students come with different kinds and qualities of preparation, and those who elect science often do not have a chance to show the influence of their scientific training upon their English before they pass out of this study. But I still think something of value may be gained, and I wish the work could be repeated in the various universities, and taken up also in the high schools. I mean to examine the records in our registrar's office of pupils graduating out of different courses in the high schools and compare their standings in English. This may perhaps give us more satisfactory results than the examination of the records of the university students.

The most extensive outline of a proposed experiment is the following. It comes from a well-known investigator in the Teachers' College of Columbia University. He criticises the experiment described in the quotation as "extraordinarily carelessly devised and lazily administered," and goes on to say:

Even conclusive proof can be obtained as to the exact amount of the value of composition work in improving the ability to write English, in case there is such.

If, for instance, five or six or more colleges would split the freshman class into two sections, dividing them at random (alphabetically), and would give one section theme-writing and the other a reading course, data could readily be obtained that would settle the question.

The data should be four or more themes written during the first two weeks of the year by all the students, and a similar number written during the last two weeks of the year.

To make the test valid requires (1) that the students be representative of the general class "college students," and not peculiar in any respect; (2) that there be enough of them to reduce to a negligible quantity the chance variation in quality of the work of individuals which occurs in theme-writing as in anything else; (3) that the instruction in theme-writing and in the reading course be of the same relative grade of efficiency (*e. g.*, if the instructors in the theme courses are such that out of a hundred college instructors picked at random 27 per cent. would be superior to them, then the instructors in the reading courses must also average at the same percentile grade).

(1) Would be satisfied by picking students at random from colleges picked at random.

(2) Would be satisfied, I am fairly sure, by four hundred individuals in each of the two classes, "students with a year's theme work" and "students without that, but with a year's reading course in its place." Probably two hundred in each class would do to get a result accurate within 10 per cent."

(3) Would be satisfied by the random selection of pairs of instructors at approximately the same rate of salary in the case of each pair.

It would be possible to answer the question even without splitting classes into two sections, though less surely and less easily.

If eight or more colleges now giving regular theme courses would provide the data mentioned above, and eight or more colleges giving approximately the same quality of general work would do the same, but replace their theme courses by reading courses during the year, the data would serve.

The matter of gaining an exact measure of the results of the year's work in the case of both sorts of training, and of comparing these measures, is a very elementary problem in statistics. If ten fairly trustworthy critics of English writing, *e. g.*, assistants in rhetoric in colleges, and four experts, *e. g.*, editors or college professors, would each read 300 themes, or if twenty assistants and eight experts would each read 150 themes, and if the expenses of correspondence were defrayed, anyone skilled in handling educational statistics would probably be willing to work up a report on the data and risk his reputation upon its accuracy.

There are means of getting precise measures of the improvement of the ability to write good English; measures that will not be invalidated by personal bias, or be so vague as not to advance us beyond common-sense opinion.

It is impossible for me to take the time to describe in more detail how the test themes should be obtained, *e. g.*, whether all should write on the same subject in some cases or not; whether a time limit should be set in some cases or not; whether more than four themes are needed or not. If one knew just what opportunity could be granted by teachers of English in the colleges for any such experiment, one could plan its details with surety.

The only difficulty in the world is to get the data. If colleges would turn over to me the data I mention and money to hire men to read the themes, I could get the answer in a month. The exact statistical treatment is perfectly possible.

We are now prepared to take up the discussion of the question suggested by the quotation from the article in the *Century Magazine*. The comments upon the quotation are not easily summarized in a few words. But they generally emphasize the fact that composition is an art rather than a science, and therefore can be mastered only by practice; and this preferably under competent instruction. They point out important aspects of work in composition that may or may not co-exist along with technical correctness, such as unity of conception, logical development of a theme, proportion of parts. These and many other matters that have to do with the work of the accomplished prose-writer are, they urge, the very things that trouble us most, even

when we have read widely and carefully for years, and have given anxious thought to the task of expressing ourselves with clearness and precision.

I should, however, be very unfair to the contributors to this discussion were I to attempt in a word or two to summarize their arguments. I must therefore be content to indicate thus briefly their general drift, and allow as many as possible to speak for themselves.

As a matter of fairness I present first the views of those who are in general agreement with the position of the writer of the article in the *Century*. Says one:

I hesitate to express an opinion which is still unsettled in my own mind. I am, however, somewhat strongly inclined to sympathize with the writer from whom you quote. Of the two, I feel sure that reading is better training than writing; but I do not believe that either will help a student to write well if he has to be driven to it. I think, therefore, that the first aim of the teacher of English to underclassmen in college should be to interest them in what they read. If he succeeds in this, they will perhaps afterward be ready to profit by instruction in the principles of rhetoric; if he does not succeed in the first task, I think the second is in most cases foredoomed. I have known of men who got little pleasure or profit from their instruction in English literature, yet learned a good deal from their later work in rhetoric; but in my experience such cases have been decidedly exceptional.

Of the same general tenor is the following:

Wide reading is certainly, in my opinion, much more valuable than study of the text-book and practice in theme-writing—in the proportion of ten to one more valuable. For, by reading, the student attains a vocabulary, an array of phrases and idioms, and a notion of the qualities of style. Not one of these benefits, it strikes me, has ever been attained by the text-book and the required essay. Teaching English composition to a student who is unread is much like trying to make bricks without straw.

Says another:

The writer seems to me to have overstated his case. I should agree with him, however, that in many of our colleges there is too much theme-writing. For some years I have had a section of freshmen in English, and I feel strongly that the daily themes which by the custom of the institution I must require of them, are not only unproductive of good, but by their monotony they depress the student, and render him less capable of genuine pleasure in composition. I hope for a change, but I trust that it will not be quite so radical as that suggested by this quotation. My own plan would be to give

two-thirds or three-fourths of the time to reading, and to require a few themes. These would give the student a chance to try his hand, and should be criticised with reference to matters in which reading is not a sure help.

Apart from some very brief expressions of opinion, on the whole favoring the extreme position taken in our quotation, this is nearly all I have to offer on the one side. On the other hand, the opponents of this position furnish an embarrassing mass of material, of which I can present but a small part. Says one:

Looked at theoretically, the proposition that a pupil can learn to write good English by reading Shakspeare, with no practice in composition, is as absurd as to maintain that one may become a good pianist by listening systematically to good piano-playing; or that one may become a good skater or a good painter by watching the performances of those who excel in these arts. I believe that the great fundamental error which lies at the bottom of our prevalent unsuccessful teaching of English is that of considering English composition as a science, and not as an art. If it is a science, then the comparatively easy method of sound instruction in rhetorical principles will be successful. But if it is an art, then, like every other art, it can be mastered only by long and faithful practice.

Another says:

I do not think that there is any necessary connection between wide reading and good writing. I have myself known mature men, scholars of exceptionally wide reading in many languages, who wrote in a style not absolutely incorrect indeed, but exceedingly dull and difficult. Wide reading forms the style and enlarges the vocabulary of the born writer, the man who, like Stevenson, reads with an instinctive feeling for style, in its broad effects and its niceties of phrase. But such a reader turns naturally from reading to writing, using what he has gained from the style of others, unconsciously or (as in Stevenson's case again) by a deliberate reproduction.

Such cases manifestly give no support to the generalization in your quotation. The Stevensons hardly enter into the problem of the instructor in English. The fine appreciation of style in others is naturally and commonly associated with the power and probably with the desire to write, but this conscious and discriminating appreciation of style is rare. Thousands read widely who neither possess nor acquire it; reading for the matter and oblivious of the manner. In such cases wide reading has but little or no effect on style.

In general I should say, that the art of writing (so far as it can be learned at all) must be learned by writing, as the art of painting must be learned in the studio rather than by looking at pictures in a gallery. Practice in either art should begin early. As to the experiment cited, it seems permissible to ask, if the results claimed were gained by a study of Shakspeare, why give

up reading for writing in the sophomore year, or the junior year, or the senior? If the ability to write will come by reading, a very burdensome occupation will be gone.

It is important to note that, in the judgment of a Harvard instructor—

the opinion quoted from the *Century* is not borne out by the experience of the department of English at Harvard. We find a marked difference between the work of the freshman and sophomore classes in English composition, a difference which shows that the writing of the same man before the course in freshman composition and after it, is technically of very different quality. With one exception all the members of the department who teach English composition agree in this opinion.

Objection to the position taken by the writer of the article in the *Century* is raised in the following report on the ground of psychology:

There is a great difference between (1) interpreting visual forms to get their meaning-equivalents, and (2) employing these forms to express one's own thoughts. A simple illustration of this is found in the case of adults who read Shakspeare and who enjoy him, but who could not possibly construct a half-dozen sentences on the Shaksperian plan, because their relations with their author have not involved this factor of reproduction of his phraseology and peculiar modes of expression. Then to proceed on the plan of having pupils read widely without the necessity of writing will not accomplish as much as the quotation claims for it. But if occasion be made for the pupil to convey his thoughts in the happiest and most effective manner, the best preparation therefor is unquestionably to have him brought into vital, sympathetic connection with models in which these qualities are embodied. An individual will grow in the power of literary expression mainly by the more or less close imitation of good models presented in his literary environment; just as in the formation of character in general it is far more effective to put one in the presence of a concrete, living personality exhibiting certain desirable qualities of conduct than to give him a program of formal rules setting forth how he should behave himself. One can imitate an act more easily than he can transform into execution a verbal description of the act. So the life, the spirit, the effectiveness at any rate of one's linguistic expression must come, it seems to me, from his reading rather than from his formal study.

But still formal, technical things must often be learned in a formal, technical way. A pupil may read ever so widely and still go on using the split infinitive in his own writing. Again, some of the larger characteristics of good expression will often be missed by even the widest reader if his attention has not been especially directed to such matters. For instance, I have in

mind now a man who has pastured in all the richest literary fields, but who frequently presents an anti-climax in his written performances. The fact is that most readers are interested in the content of what they are reading, and not in the forms of expression, and so they never get hold of these latter so as to use them. Without doubt much experience will give a certain kind of consciousness of things technical, yet it is certain that in some cases, at any rate, this consciousness will not be vivid enough to have a controlling influence upon the individual's writing. It must be remembered that the processes involved in motor execution are not immediately connected with the processes of interpretation of visual symbols, so when a man takes a pencil in his hand it does not follow by any means that the experience gained through the eye will determine the activities of the fingers.

This connection is to be established by a certain amount of attention which will weld together the graphic and other language processes, and the initiative in turning the attention upon the proper things must often be taken by some one other than the learner himself.

Emphasizing the same general thought in a different fashion is the following:

Though the average student may be a wide reader, he is certainly a careless reader; he will never acquire a good style by unconscious imitation. In every college are to be found students who spell badly, who punctuate indifferently, whose diction is meager and inaccurate, who have little feeling for idiomatic phrasing or for sentence-structure, who will write an entire essay in one or two paragraphs, or who will make a paragraph of each sentence; so blind have they been to the examples of correct usage that have been before their eyes ever since they learned to read.

In the matter of form, of constructing an essay that shall have an organic relation of parts, even very good students may be deplorably weak; in fact, one may have a good command of language, yet fail entirely to write about his subject. I quote an instructive passage from the *Autobiography* of Philip Gilbert Hamerton: "I offered two or three papers to the 'Westminster,' which were declined, and then I wrote to the editor asking him if he would be so good as to explain, for my own benefit and guidance, what were the reasons for their rejection. His answer came, and was both kind and judicious. 'An article,' he told me, 'ought to be an organic whole, with a pre-arranged order and proportion amongst its parts. There ought to be a beginning, a middle, and an end.' This was a very good and much-needed lesson, for at that time I had no notion of a synthetic *ordonnance* of parts."

This lesson, I submit, might have been given by a college teacher; but a teacher of that kind Hamerton never had; and I admit that the lessons that are given by an editor—when he is willing to give them—are more deeply imprinted in the mind, and are more completely learned. Certainly this lesson was an important one for the youth, who—whatever his merit as a

writer may be—eventually became a successful editor and the author of a dozen or more of interesting books.

If the college cannot help the student in the matter of English Composition, why expect the preparatory school to succeed? Or why stop there? Is it right to place so much drudgery upon the grammar and primary schools? Where is the line to be drawn? At spelling? or punctuation? or at the ability to construct sentences that are grammatical? Or shall we leave everything that comes under the head of English Composition to be learned by unconscious imitation, by absorption, and devote our energies to the teaching of Shakspeare?

The question really resolves itself into this: Can instructors in English Composition accomplish anything with their students? I believe that even the dullest students can be taught enough to justify the time and the nervous energy that are expended by their instructors, that much can be done toward the correction of faults, something even in the direction of positive excellences.

I freely admit that this work involves a considerable outlay of time, energy, and money; but I doubt whether the result is correspondingly any smaller than is the case with certain other subjects. In colleges in which mathematics is required throughout the freshman year, can the instructors felicitate themselves upon the attainments of the lower half of the class, especially upon those of the lowest quarter of the class? And do not the members of this lowest quarter hold on to the little English that they have learned, and get more profit from it, than the members of the lowest quarter in mathematics get from their little learning?

One of the most elaborate of the reports is the following, which covers a large number of the questions suggested by the quotation, and is in harmony with the spirit of many briefer statements of opinion:

Since the quotation seems to imply a confusing distinction between rhetoric and composition, let me say that I understand the topic for discussion to be the college study of prose composition and diction, both theory (as in manuals, lectures, and analysis of good prose) and practice (as by the writing of themes regularly for regular criticism). This study, by whatever name it be called, is not uniformly valuable in all its parts. For first, *diction* (*i. e.*, all that relates to words and phrases separately and to their harmony) cannot, to any great degree, be directly inculcated. The development of a man's vocabulary being the development of his experience, a theme-reader's criticism of it is limited usually to correction and general suggestion, *i. e.*, is largely negative. This is the less unfortunate since the best means toward range, precision, and force of phrase is reading. I should have thought this a truism, if it had not been so solemnly affirmed in the quotation. And I have to add only (1) that "wide" reading is not so likely to be so productive as deep reading; and (2) that just here courses in rhetoric and courses in literature, instead of clashing, may complement each other.

Assuming, then, that in general (it would by no means always be true of a given case) diction may be improved as well by reading as by writing, we have still unanswered the whole question of composition in the literal sense; *i. e.*, of construction. But this is the proper domain of rhetoric. Therefore the fallacy in the inference quoted on the circular is in arguing mainly beside the point. The real question is in effect this: Can the average student learn as well how to make his own writing lucid and forcible in construction by reading the best poems, plays, and essays, as by practice and criticism directed toward his specific ends? Remembering that the student may do both, and in fact often does both concurrently, observe that composition may be roughly divided into the *logical* sort, the sort that proceeds from proposition to proposition, and the *artistic* sort, the sort whose progress is not measured by propositions. The two sorts overlap, especially in what we call essays, but the distinction is real. Now the practice of the latter sort, the artistic or literary, is the affair of the few. The study of it in masterpieces covers almost the whole range of college courses in English literature, and I suppose we all agree to this as part of any scheme of liberal education; but the practice, the composing, for instance, of short stories, is the affair of the few, and these few precisely the ones to whom teaching, whether of rhetoric or of literature, is least important. That college courses in rhetoric are useful even to these is sufficiently established by experience: but the point is that such courses must be a small part numerically of college work in rhetoric.

We are brought, then, by exclusion to this important fact, so important, it seems to me, that it ought to be made cardinal in our arrangement of courses: *the main business of rhetoric with the undergraduate mass is to teach by precept, by analysis of masterpieces, by example, logical composition.*

To this I should add a corollary: It is also clearly within the province of rhetoric as we now use the word, to teach artistic composition; but since this is the ground where courses called "rhetoric" and courses called "literature" overlap, the time devoted to it by a given group of courses in rhetoric should depend upon the number and character of the courses in literature; should depend, that is, on the particular college. In this regard colleges vary, and will doubtless continue to vary, widely, both in the extension given to the terms *rhetoric*, *English*, and *literature*, and in the actual proportion of hours given, on the one hand mainly to reading, and on the other hand mainly to writing. In short, the teaching of rhetoric may profitably spend on the artistic side so much time as seems wise in a given college to complement the teaching of literature; so much, furthermore, as will give to any student the opportunity for consecutive criticism of any artistic form he shows himself capable of pursuing; but in every college the teaching of rhetoric must devote its main time to the training of the average student on the logical side.

Finally, let me explain what I wish to include in that term logical. Argumentation, of course, debate, and other kinds of speechmaking. Persuasion must always remain for most men the main skill sought by rhetoric. Its

importance is not in the least diminished by such changes in outward form as have ensued upon modern conditions. But the term logical is meant to include also what the books call exposition, either as subsidiary to persuasion or as independent and self-sufficing; in a word, to include essays as well as speeches. Either may or may not be literary in diction; both are logical in construction. Logical progress, in the whole and in every part, the lucid conduct of a theme to its conclusion, is attainable by every student through courses in rhetoric; it is attainable, without immensely great labor, in no other way; and through courses in the history of literature or through "wide" reading without practice it is not attainable at all. "Reading," in the sense of logical analysis, the study of the whole framework and of each part, is of course directly contributory; but this kind of "reading" is confined practically to courses in rhetoric.

This logical grasp, this bringing of knowledge to bear, which is one of the most fundamentally valuable results of a college education, is subserved more directly, I believe, than in any other single way, by the teaching of rhetoric. Essentially different from all other courses in seeking directly a skill, an ability, rhetoric may thus be made to serve in particular each course on which it depends for material, and in general the great object of all the courses together. Here, it seems to me, is its main claim to a place in any scheme of college education. Whatever was once meant to be included in the idea of logic as the "organon," our "organon" in college today is rhetoric.

To expressions of opinion so able and so complete it is quite unnecessary that this committee add anything. The case for reading as a sufficient independent means of teaching composition has evidently, in the judgment of most college teachers, not yet been made out. The burden of proof, therefore, still rests upon the advocates of reading as against theme-writing. No one doubts the value of reading as an aid to composition, and most of us will probably agree that the constant endeavor to draw something out of nothing is as dismal a failure as the attempt to get up steam in an empty boiler. On the other hand, to rely wholly upon reading as a means of reaching the rhetorical goal is, to quote the picturesque phrase of one report, about as satisfactory as trying to walk on one leg instead of two.

WILLIAM E. MEAD,

Secretary of the Pedagogical Section of the
Modern Language Association.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,
Middletown, Conn.

THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH.¹

I. IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

LIST NO. 1: QUESTIONS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

1. What subjects studied in the primary and grammar schools do you include under the term *English*, or *Language*?
2. How many hours of the week are devoted to each of these subjects in the first grade? in the third? in the sixth? in the eighth (or ninth)?
3. What do you regard as the chief aims of the English work viewed as a whole?
4. In addition to the natural influences and opportunities afforded by the schoolroom for improving the children's speech, is there any organized effort made in your school to improve the spoken English of the pupils—(a) as to quality of voice, (b) as to clearness of articulation, (c) as to common illiteracies of speech?
5. Do you have spoken composition work to any extent?
6. Is the written composition work of the earlier years especially designed to cultivate *accuracy*, or *facility*?
7. Have you any opinions on the teaching of spelling that would be of service to others who are struggling with the spelling problem? In teaching spelling, do you believe in making an especial point of syllabication? Do you approve of oral spelling, or do you think that all spelling recitations should be in writing?
8. Are especial details of written form (such as the comma in a series, quotation marks, etc.) assigned to given grades for especially thorough study?
9. What proportion of the composition work is examined by the teacher? What proportion do the pupils revise without rewriting? What proportion do they rewrite?
10. Are the same standards of excellence insisted upon in all written exercises, whether they are or are not regarded as "compositions"?
11. What are the sources of supply for composition subjects?
12. Are your pupils encouraged to write often with the thought of a specific audience?
13. Do you ever interchange compositions with other schools for mutual criticism by the pupils?
14. Are themes often read before the class by pupil or by teacher?
15. How large a proportion of the reading supplied in regular and supplementary "reading books" deserves to be called literature,—in the third grade? the sixth grade? the eighth (ninth) grade?

¹ Report of Committee on Methods of Teaching and Studying English, presented to the New England Association of Teachers of English, by the Committee on Methods of Teaching and Studying English, March, 1902.

16. Apart from the literature supplied in the reading books, is there a definite program in literature for each grade, or is each teacher left to her own judgment in the choice of literature? If there is a definite program in literature, we shall be very grateful for as full a statement of it as you may find it convenient to send.

17. Does the study of literature in your schools include the following kinds of work? (a) Reading literature to the class by the teacher; (b) reading literature aloud in class by pupils; (c) reading literature at home, to be discussed in class; (d) telling stories by the teacher; (e) telling stories by the children; (f) recitation of poetry by the pupils?

18. Assuming that the main effort of the teacher is to interest the pupils in *what* the author has to say, is any effort made to make them conscious and appreciative of *how* the author says it—in the third grade? the sixth? the eighth (ninth)?

19. In what lines is there the greatest need of improvement in the English work?

20. How, in your judgment, may such improvement be effected?

Your committee has decided that it is practically impossible to report upon all the phases of English work at this meeting, and proposes to discuss the subject of expression, including both spoken and written English, omitting thereby an equally important if not more important matter, and to many of us a more interesting matter, the teaching of literature, except in so far as the teaching of literature must be considered in dealing with the question of the pupil's expression.

As you are aware, three series of questions on the teaching of English were sent out by your committee about the middle of January. These questions were sent not only to members of the association, but to elementary and secondary schools, both public and private, throughout New England, and to colleges in and outside of New England. We have taken it for granted that the purpose of the association is not to accumulate statistics but to learn of one another and from outsiders how better work may be done in the teaching of English, therefore we have attempted to secure information from only a limited number of representative persons. My own questions were sent to seventy persons connected with elementary school work, forty of whom are outside of this association. The list includes superintendents of schools, principals of schools, teachers connected with training schools, and teachers in elementary schools. Forty replies have been

received, fifteen from members and twenty-five from persons outside of the association. A number of the replies have been unexpectedly full and valuable, and all have been useful and suggestive. I feel greatly indebted to my correspondents for their courtesy and assistance. It would be entirely unscientific to assume that from these replies we can know what is being done throughout New England; the replies, however, have this value: they call attention to fruitful lines of endeavor which may well be imitated, to errors which are to be avoided, and to debatable points which, it is hoped, may be discussed by this association.

The province of a committee on methods is in itself a debatable question, inasmuch as the term methods is variously understood and frequently abused. In this report I shall use the term to signify the means employed in attempting to realize the purposes of the English work. This immediately suggests that the whole question of method depends upon a much more important and more fundamental matter—the question of purpose or aim. The shallowness and ineffectualness of many so-called methods are due, I am convinced, to the inadequacy of the teacher's conception of purpose. To be specific, a teacher of average ability who sees with absolute clearness that one purpose for which the state employs her is that she may teach children from illiterate homes to use English intelligibly, who sees it so clearly that she weighs her own work in the balance and finds it wanting when she fails to attain this end, may be trusted to find intelligent and effectual methods; whereas the teacher who fails to see this objective point clearly may use the exercises elaborated in language books and may imitate the methods of successful teachers—and all with no results worth the name. I do not wish to imply for a moment that method is a matter of slight importance; it is a matter of grave importance; but it should take its true place in subordination to purpose.

In view of this relation between purpose and method, I thought it best, in sending out my questions, to ask about the purposes of the English work before making inquiries in regard to the methods. It seemed necessary, however, to understand

first what each writer included under the term "English," or "language." In answer to this inquiry I find every variety of opinion, from the one extreme of including the entire curriculum under the term "English" to the other of making the term "English" synonymous with composition. There is a corresponding variety in the statements as to the purposes of the English work; but a few of the answers point out distinctly what seems to your committee to be the twofold purpose of the English work: the first is a practical purpose—the ability to handle the mother-tongue, to read it, to speak it, to write it with such intelligence that a certain independence is secured, a power to understand and to be understood. Now it is perfectly possible to develop this practical power of interpretation and expression without developing a love for literature; a person may speak and read and write with intelligence without being a lover of good books; here, then, we have the second aim, spiritual rather than practical in its import, far-reaching in its ultimate influence on life. The far-sighted English teacher works with all these ends in view; every exercise that goes by the name of English in her program has for its primary purpose one or more of these aims. Such a teacher constantly judges the efficacy of her work from this standpoint of purpose. "Do my pupils speak better, read more intelligently, write more easily, do they choose and read good books?"—these are the practical tests which she applies to her own work.

Before considering the remaining questions, a word of explanation is necessary. Two most essential features of the elementary English work are not touched upon in these inquiries, the methods of teaching beginners how to read and the methods of teaching formal grammar. The first subject was omitted because, although one of the most essentially interesting subjects to the primary teacher and to the student of general education, it is not a question which touches closely the interests of an association such as this. Grammar was omitted because it is too large a subject to be considered in so limited an investigation.

Questions 4 and 5 deal with speech-training. A child's equipment in speech when he enters the elementary school is

on an entirely different plane from his equipment in any other phase of the English work. He is not able to read his mother-tongue, and he is not able to write it; he may or may not have begun to develop a taste for good literature, for he may have come from a home where *Mother Goose*, the old fairy tales, and the Bible stories are known and loved, or he may have come from a home barren of these and of kindred joys; but he invariably enters the primary school with considerable development in the matter of speech; he has a large vocabulary, when one considers how brief a space of time has been devoted to accumulating it, and certain habits of construction, articulation, voice, inflection, etc., that immediately individualize him. Here is the English teacher's most perplexing problem. By means of wise instruction she may teach a child how to read and write, she may even cultivate his unformed literary taste by giving him the best only—the best for a child, that is—but in the matter of speech, she must take him as he is, with all his imperfections on his head; she must not only form new habits, she must break up a score of old ones; the good must not be added to the bad, it must displace the bad.

In answering the question, which occurs at the end of the circular, as to the lines in which there is the greatest need of improvement, especial emphasis is laid on spoken English. It is a satisfaction to find that this need is recognized, for the recognition of an evil is the first step toward its reform. In my own experience the work done in this direction by our best teachers of English is less systematized and less effective than in any other phase of the English work. And yet the answers to questions 4 and 5 are very encouraging. Out of the thirty-three answers received, twenty-four say *yes* to both questions, and some writers add, in answer to the inquiry in regard to common illiteracies, "constant effort is made." Now, constant effort is not organized effort, and I have sometimes suspected that our failure is due, in part at least, to this constant, faithful, nagging effort. "The correction that does not correct" is a familiar experience here: a child is guilty of some solecism in his speech, the teacher amiably supplies the correct expression, perhaps the

child repeats it mechanically, perhaps he does not repeat it at all; the lesson proceeds, the next day the same thing occurs, the constant effort of the faithful teacher is renewed, and so on to the end of the chapter.

Now, this is both unphilosophical and unworthy. An organized effort in this matter implies at least three things that may be done in any school: First, a classified list may be made of the faults most common among the pupils; second, although no teacher should ignore any of the faults mentioned, to each teacher may be assigned certain errors against which a special crusade may be carried on while the pupils are under her charge; third, every teacher needs to see clearly what means are at her disposal, and needs to use these means intelligently. These are the obvious means available in the schoolroom for improving and developing the children's speech—environment, instruction, practice. Because our speech is so largely the result of our environment, some enthusiasts have believed that nothing is necessary in the schoolroom but a wholesome and stimulating environment; and I agree heartily with them that this is the first essential. Given a teacher whose speech is first interesting and then accurate, given a generous supply of good reading and a wide range of wholesome interests, and the speech of the children must inevitably be benefited in many ways: their vocabulary must increase, their constructions must improve, their articulation and inflection even may become more cultivated; but this is not enough, as experience has often proved. There are two types of people whose speech is not reformed by environment: first, those who are naturally oblivious to all forms of speech, who notice no difference between their own speech and that of others, who are unaware that they make errors; and, second, those who have a few bad habits of speech fixed by so many years of practice that, although they may know better theoretically, they make these particular errors unconsciously. Let me cite two examples that have come under my observation recently: One is a girl who came from an illiterate home, but who, until the age of fourteen, was in school under the charge of teachers who spoke good English; at that age she left school

and took up an occupation that carried her from family to family; as she was an absolutely trustworthy and friendly soul she was brought into close relations with people of much cultivation and refinement; her opportunities for hearing delightful English were unusual; she was very observing in many ways, and in her topics of conversation and her knowledge of the ways of refined living soon began to show the result of her environment: but her speech remained practically unchanged, full of the most glaring illiteracies. It was quite evident that she needed something besides environment. The other was a girl who had excellent school advantages until she was twenty years old; her vocabulary was unusually large, her appreciation of literature was genuine and ardent; in the course of fifteen minutes I heard her use *lay* for *lie*, *I wisht* for *I wish*, and *like* for *as*. She, too, had needed something besides environment. Both girls had needed, early in their school lives, to have their errors of speech brought to their attention and the correct forms supplied, *i. e.*, they had needed definite instruction; both had needed practice in saying the right things, in feeling their organs of speech produce the unfamiliar combinations; a conscious effort to do the right thing was essential. (Some of us are very much afraid of making children conscious of their speech: I think this is an unwarrantable anxiety.) And somehow or other—and it is perfectly feasible—instruction and practice must be so managed that an enthusiasm for good speech is aroused; this is the most essential element of all; this accounts for the fact that, whereas, one girl from an illiterate home continues in her habits of illiteracy, another who has received the same instruction, but in whom an earnest desire for better speech has been aroused, uses a language conspicuously different from that of her parents. Environment, instruction, practice, and all of them shot through with the interest that stimulates to endeavor—these means are at the disposal of every one of us.

A word about the nature of the practice is necessary. It must strike directly at the fault in question, and not beat about the bush. A child whose articulation is slovenly, who drops his

g's or puts an *r* after the *aw* sound, may go on repeating such words as *singing* and *saw* after his teacher indefinitely, and he will still drop his *g's* and use that intrusive *r*—so retiring and coy in our average New England speech; what he needs is to use such words as *singing* in the midst of other words and such words as *saw* with a vowel sound immediately following. A story is told—it may be a story only, but every teacher knows that it is essentially true—of a boy who used the expression, “I have went home;” thereupon his teacher made him write *I have gone* fifty times after school; the teacher was not in the room when the task was finished, and, in order to explain his disappearance, he added in good faith at the end of his paper, “I have went home,” and departed, leaving the document on his desk, an unwitting monument to the teacher’s folly.

One other somewhat pressing question presents itself in connection with spoken English: How shall the children’s sentence sense be trained? how shall the sentence habit, as we like to call it, be established? Some people believe that the children should never speak in school except in complete sentences. I knew a school in which this rule of action was carried so far that, upon being asked by the teacher, as she pointed out a word in the spelling-lesson, “What word is that?” the children would reply, “I think the word is so-and-so.” Now, the absurdity and wastefulness of this are evident. Moreover, the effort to have every expression of thought in the shape of a full-fledged sentence when observing and discussing things in which the pupils are really interested, such as pictures, or plants, or books, is entirely contrary to the customs of cultivated people. Imagine visiting an art gallery with a friend, and, as you walked from painting to painting enjoying the spontaneous interchange of opinion, being suddenly forced to express yourself in complete sentences only! Of course, the excuse offered for this exaggerated method is that it is difficult to draw the line, and that, unless children are required to talk in sentences all the time, they will neither talk nor write in complete sentences when occasion requires. I can only say that this statement is not borne out by my own observation and experience; in my own classes and in

watching the work of other people, I have found it perfectly possible to carry on a natural, informal conversation—an interchange of impressions—about a picture for example, with no thought of sentences, with no thought of anything but the picture and an occasional correction in pronunciation or the choice of a word—and later to gather together in an orderly and complete way all that has been thought and said, as a bit of oral or written composition. The point lies just here: the habit of good sentence construction and transition is due to two things—first, to a knowledge of what a sentence is and of what constitutes suitable transition from one sentence to another (not a knowledge that can express itself in definition, but a knowledge that makes it possible to recognize that this group of words is a sentence, and that group is not); and second, much practice in making and combining sentences. Children learn with surprising quickness to differentiate between the group of words constituting a part of a sentence and the complete sentence; this is observable in the lowest grade. It is true the teachers are often unduly afraid of the term *sentence*, and say to the children, "Give me the *whole* story," and the child responds with the complete sentence. The little child's most conspicuous fault in transition is to introduce every sentence with *and*; when this error is pointed out, however, he takes a distinct pride in overcoming it. So far as practice is concerned, there are numerous opportunities that can be made use of every day: in the higher grades the formal recitation from topics of history and geography, and perhaps physiology and the explanation of problems in arithmetic; and, in the lower grades, reproduction of stories, simple accounts of personal experience, descriptions of the pictures that have been discussed informally—all combine to provide ample opportunity for the making and combining of sentences.

Some one may ask whether following an informal conversation about a picture by a formal rearrangement and restatement of what has been already said does not involve an anti-climax from the standpoint of interest. That depends entirely, I have found, upon the motive or purpose of the more formal oral exercise; if it is in preparation, for instance, for a written exercise

which is to be taken home to some one who has not seen the picture, or if any other appealing social motive is used, there need be no falling off in interest. I would say, too, in passing, that, with the exception of literature, no subject of study found in the elementary school gives so delightful and natural an opportunity of enlarging the children's vocabulary and of teaching them a discriminating use of words as the effort to express what is seen and enjoyed in a picture.

In regard to this matter of spoken composition, then, a matter which involves proper choice of words, proper combination of words into sentences, and suitable transition from one sentence to another, I have been trying to say simply this—that a knowledge of what is right and much practice are needed, and that such practice need not encroach upon the perfectly natural and informal interchange of opinion that should be a part of the schoolroom life.

Question 6 asks whether the written composition work of the earlier years in the elementary school is especially designed to cultivate accuracy or facility. Of the thirty-four answers received to this question, eight say both, ten say accuracy, and sixteen say facility. You will see, then, that a decided majority of those who choose one consider facility the more important matter. This opinion does not agree with the opinion of your committee. To us it seems that accuracy should not be sacrificed to facility, as is too often the case when facility is the prominent aim. Written forms are matters of habit, comparatively easy to acquire provided the practice be as nearly correct as possible from the beginning, very difficult to reform if the practice has been inaccurate and careless. Of course, the reason offered here is that children who are obliged to think continually about sentences, paragraphs, punctuation, etc., are so hampered and burdened that they cannot express themselves spontaneously. There are at least two ways of meeting this obstacle: one is to give ample opportunity for spontaneity and facility in oral expression, the other is to familiarize children with the forms of written English through well-selected copying and dictation exercises, in which the attention is necessarily on the

form, and through which the use of correct forms may become habitual. Then, in their written composition—although they must give some thought to form, as they know that accuracy is expected—the pupils will at the same time use quite unconsciously many of the correct forms which have been growing into matters of habit. I am inclined to think that the accurate emptiness of the little themes that we sometimes get from the older grammar-school children is due not so much to the stress laid upon accuracy as to the lack of effort made to enlarge the children's experience and to stimulate their thought.

Question 7 deals with spelling. It would take more time than can possibly be given to report and discuss the interesting answers to this question. I will say, in passing, that thirty persons express approval of syllabication and only one disapproval, and that there is a unanimous verdict in favor of more or less oral spelling. One reply contains a statement of much significance, which I commend to your consideration. This reply comes from the Horace Mann School, a school for the education of the deaf, and is as follows: "The pupils educated in the Horace Mann School, as a rule, do not misspell. We think this due to their constant use of written language."

Question 8 asks whether certain details of written form are assigned to particular grades for especial study. Twenty-seven answer this question in the affirmative, seven in the negative. I should like to read three replies to this question, each from a writer whose position and success give weight to his opinion. The first says:

No. Punctuation, being a means of making the writer's thoughts clear to the reader, should be studied in connection with the expression of thought.

(Beyond the period, comma, question and quotation marks, the use of punctuation cannot be successfully taught until the pupil is able to construct long sentences and finds the need of punctuation to make himself clear. We do not attempt much beyond what has been stated below the seventh grade.) The second says:

We do assign special uses of punctuation marks, of capital letters, and certain abbreviations to each of the lower grades. I believe that, whilst this

is somewhat arbitrary, it is the effective way to get done in each grade what ought to be done.

The third says :

Yes, but they usually have to be taught again in the next grade. I have suggested that these technical facts be taught when they are first needed by the children, in whatever grade they are.

Different as these three answers are, they give the essential features of the plan that I am about to recommend. Before outlining this plan, however, it is necessary to make a distinction in the use of a term. *Teaching* a written form may mean illustrating and explaining it so that it is understood, or it may mean, in addition, giving sufficient practice to cause the use of the written form to become habitual. It seems to me that it should mean the second. The written forms that should have become habitual when a pupil enters the secondary school are the arrangement on the page with due regard to margins, the use of capitals, and the use of all the punctuation marks. Some of these—like the arrangement on the page, the capital at the beginning of the sentence, and the period at the end—are needed in the very lowest grade; others—like the semicolon, and the comma before an additional clause, as distinguished from a restrictive clause—cannot be fully understood until grammar is studied, and would naturally come in the seventh or eighth grades. Of course, whatever is taught in one grade has to be reviewed in subsequent grades; but, if it has been taught with ample practice, the reviewing takes but little time, comparatively. Now suppose the exigencies of a bit of written composition require the use of some form not yet taught, as, for example, the plural possessive in the second grade. Here the form may be shown and explained, and the brighter children will make it theirs; but it does not seem essential that the whole class should have the practice in the form necessary to make the matter an unconscious habit; that concentrated practice may come in a later grade. As for the method of study recommended in the first reply, of course the best way to introduce any new usage is in connection with the natural expression of thought when the need is felt.

In considering this question it must be borne in mind that,

when a very large and general demand is made of a teacher rather than a reasonable and definite requirement, the results are likely to be unsatisfactory; and, from the standpoint of the elementary school as a whole with its eight grades, the danger is that certain usages will require unnecessary emphasis, and that others will be almost entirely neglected. It would seem reasonable and practicable, then—and I will add that I am speaking from experience here—to assign for especial practice certain details to the grades where they are most likely to be first needed and frequently needed, at the same time to leave every teacher free to explain and illustrate other needed usages to which she cannot give an equal amount of drill, and to call for the review in each grade of all usages previously taught.

To question 9—"What proportion of the composition work is examined by the teacher? What proportion do the pupils revise without rewriting? What proportion do they rewrite?"—the replies are so varying that it is difficult to arrive at any consensus of opinion. I am quite ready to admit that this is largely the fault of the question. Of the twenty-eight who answer the first part of the question, twenty say that all or nearly all of the written work done by the pupils is examined by the teacher, five say that one-half is examined, and three imply that less than one-half is examined by the teacher. The answers to the other parts of the question are too few and too vague to make it worth while to report them. There is certainly no matter connected with the English work of the elementary school upon which it is so difficult to come to any wise conclusion; and provided the wise conclusions were reached, it would be difficult to state them briefly, inasmuch as the written English of the elementary school extends over eight years, and what is demanded by the work of the low grades differs materially from what is required in the high grades. But out of the conflicting theories and practices a few principles of action emerge. In the first place, to quote a favorite injunction, "Children should not be allowed to write for the waste basket:" this does not mean, however, that every paper of every child should be examined by the teacher; with nearly sixty pupils to the teacher, with frequent written work,

and with that written work only one feature of an exacting school program consisting of seven or eight different subjects, all taught by that one teacher, this is a practical impossibility; the teacher must, however, read enough of the papers written by each child as to discover his chief needs and his progress, and to make him recognize the fact that his work may be examined at any time and that it frequently is examined. This is not an ideal arrangement, and it points emphatically to the urgent need of fewer pupils to the teacher in the elementary school—a change more called for, probably, than any other purely administrative reform. In the second place, examination by the teacher must not mean correction by the teacher, a practice that inevitably deprives a child of 90 per cent. of the benefit that should come to him from the teacher's examination of his work; it should mean rather the indication of necessary corrections. In the third place, the pupil must show by revision that he understands the teacher's criticisms; rewriting, it seems to me, should be less frequent than revision, and should grow less not only as the work of a given year proceeds but as the total work of the elementary school proceeds, unless the nature of the criticism is such as to call for reconstruction of the entire theme rather than for correction of individual errors. In the fourth place the pupil should be trained as early as possible to become his own critic, for eventually that is what he must be. It seems worth while to state briefly a plan of work that is being successfully tried in the higher grades of an elementary school in Massachusetts. The pupils are provided with a set of questions which they have more or less in mind as they write, and which they apply deliberately to their own work after they have finished writing.

QUESTIONS.

1. Was it worth writing?
2. Is it divided into paragraphs correctly?
3. Are the paragraphs divided into sentences correctly?
4. Is the writing neat, legible, not crowded?
5. Is the meaning clear?
6. Are words used correctly?
7. Omissions?
8. Are capitals used correctly?

9. Is the spelling (including syllabication) correct?
10. Is the punctuation correct?
11. Is the grammar correct?
12. Construction?

STAGES IN THE WORK.

1. Pupils write, leaving margins on both sides.
2. Each pupil corrects his own writing, using the questions as a guide for self-criticism. He actually makes the corrections, so far as is possible. Margins not used.
3. One of the exercises is written on the blackboard. The class and teacher together discuss and correct it.
4. The exercises are distributed to the class, no one receiving the one he wrote. Each pupil examines an exercise, indicating in the margin (by number or some other symbol) the mistakes he finds, but not correcting them.
5. The teacher examines the papers (all or part) at this stage, noting the proficiency of the pupil both in writing the exercise and in criticising, adding marks of criticism, and striking out marks of criticism that should not have been made.
6. Each pupil receives his paper, bearing in the margin the marks indicating the mistakes, and copies the exercise into his book, correcting the mistakes. During this time the teacher is at the service of the class to assist them. The book must not be considered absolutely free from mistakes.

It will be readily seen that this scheme does not save the teacher work, in the early stages of its use at least; but the result ought eventually to be that the pupils become more thoughtful, more discriminating, more accurate, and that therefore in the long run the teacher's work be materially diminished. The details of the plan might of course be modified; its merit lies in these essential features: (1) definite lines of improvement known to the pupil, in which his own interest is enlisted and for which he is held responsible; (2) an opportunity to develop his critical powers by applying them both to his own work and to somebody's else; (3) a final judgment from the teacher.

Question 10 asks whether the same standards of excellence are insisted upon in all written exercises. Of the thirty-six persons who answer this question, twenty-one say *yes*; thirteen say *yes* with reservations; two say *no*. I am inclined to think that those who say *yes* with reservations are not only nearer the

truth as it is, but are nearer the truth as it should be. The same standards of spelling, for example, should be required in the rapidly written history report and in the theme carefully prepared for the English lesson; but there should certainly be a more conscious effort for fitness of expression in the latter, and in this respect the same standards should not be applied to both. I once knew a teacher in an elementary school who complained bitterly because her pupils did very careless work in English composition. "How often do your pupils write compositions?" I inquired. "Once in two weeks," was the answer. "Do you have any other written work?" "Oh, yes, the boys write their history lesson every morning." "And what sort of written English do they produce in their history exercises?" "Oh, I never pay any attention to their English in those exercises. I haven't time," was the reply. I comfort myself with the thought that this is an extreme case; but it is this type of thing—often exhibited in a less flagrant form—that is responsible for much of the slovenly, indifferent work that we find.

Question 11 asks for the nature of the subjects used for composition exercises. Almost everyone replies that the regular school subjects provide topics for composition, and perhaps half the number add to this source of supply the personal experience and outside interests of the pupils. That the school subjects should furnish a part of the material for compositions seems essential for two reasons: (1) the work done in geography, history, etc., needs the added stimulus, the demand for clear thinking and exact expression that writing requires, (2) an entire avoidance of the regular subjects of study of the schoolroom, especially if we substitute for them an attempt to stimulate the thought and imagination in unnatural directions, is likely to make composition seem like an end in itself, and this is certainly a most unfortunate attitude for teacher or pupil to take. Should we not rather ask, what are the subjects upon which the pupil has occasion to express himself both in school and outside of school, and in the next place what are the matters in which it is desirable to arouse his interest and upon which he should be led to express himself? In other words, his own life, and the larger

life of the world as it is now making itself or as it is recorded in books, and into which the teacher hopes to lead him, should furnish the topics upon which he is to write. This basis of choice affords great variety and contributes materially to a child's education, preparing him for the real exigencies that he is to meet and at the same time increasing his appreciation of some things that otherwise he might pass by unheedingly.

Questions 12, 13, and 14 are as follows: 12. "Are your pupils encouraged to write often with the thought of a specific audience?" 13. "Do you ever interchange compositions with other schools, for mutual criticism by the pupils?" 14. "Are themes often read before the class by pupil or by teacher?"

Of course the controlling thought in all the practices suggested by this group of questions is the appeal to the pupil's social instinct, his natural desire for communication, his natural inclination to share his thought with others. Such practices give purpose and dignity to his work. The recognition and application of this motive in written work will be fully discussed in the two reports that are to follow. The answers that I have received indicate that considerable work of this sort is done in the elementary schools.

Questions 19 and 20 ask in what phases of the English work there is the greatest need of improvement and how such improvement may be effected. Sixteen think that expression, either oral or written, or both, calls most loudly for improvement; four say spelling; two speak of the need of cultivating a greater interest in literature; one speaks of oral reading. It is evident that our views as to the greatest needs of our pupils are likely to vary with our own individual interests and with the special conditions under which we teach. In a district in which the majority of the pupils are drawn from illiterate homes, the need of improvement in spoken English is certainly the conspicuous and crying necessity; in a school in which the English is fairly good and the prevailing current of life vapid and frivolous, the need of a thorough interest in good, wholesome books impresses the earnest teacher most strongly; in a district in which the superintendent calls for frequent proofs of the pupils' skill in English

composition, the teacher would hardly be human if she did not regard improvement in written English as the conspicuous need. Although my own belief is that our greatest need in the elementary school is to establish among our pupils the habit of reading good books, the scope of this paper demands that I should consider under question 20 only the means that may be used in effecting improvement in the pupils' power to express themselves.

Many familiar remedies are proposed, such as better teachers, greater thoroughness, patient and persistent instruction; and one man who believes better spoken English to be our greatest need suggests that a more discriminating choice of parents is the only remedy. In attempting to express my own view, I can find no words so suggestive as those used by President Eliot in a memorable address on "Education" delivered last November under the auspices of the Twentieth Century Club. These are his words:

Concerning an educated individual, we may fairly ask, "Can he see straight? Can he recognize the fact? Next, can he draw a just inference from established facts?"

We teachers of English need to see straight, to recognize the fact, to draw just inferences from established facts. There are two sets of facts with which we need to concern ourselves: first, the purposes of our work, *i. e.*, the ideal ends — none the less facts — for which we are striving; second, the facts as to the present condition of our pupils. I think that I am justified in saying that as a body we do not see with half the needed clearness the ends toward which we should be working. I am sure that we do not see things as they are with the largeness of view and the hopefulness that the facts warrant. We find among many teachers an extremely pessimistic attitude about the power of expression, especially in speech, shown by the rising generation; it is fashionable in some quarters to talk as if our English were going to the dogs. I believe profoundly that there never was a time when English was spoken and written so well by so large a proportion of the people. If you feel pessimistic you need only to compare the pupils of a great public school system like that of Boston with their parents. The children from

educated homes are following in the parents' footsteps, although their English is, of course, immature; and the children from illiterate homes are immeasurably above their parents in the purity of their speech and in their ability to write. As an indication of the work that the schools have been doing, may I give a bit of personal experience? For seventeen years now I have taught girls coming from some six or more Boston high schools and from scattering high schools outside of Boston; the written English of the pupils has improved conspicuously within these years; a set of themes from a present entering class is far and away ahead of those prepared by the entering classes of fifteen and seventeen years ago. The spoken English is not conspicuously better. This indicates the direction in which the best work has been done, and the direction in which better work is needed; but it shows above all how encouraging the facts are.

To greater clearness in our grasp of the facts and their significance, we need to add better organization of our work. Better organization can only come through co-operation; and co-operation means working with approximately common aims, with methods that do not defeat one another, although there may be infinite variety in them, and with a rational agreement as to the division of labor, which shall save us, on the one hand, from doing over one another's work, and, on the other, from altogether neglecting some essential detail. For the individual teacher I would ask, then, greater clearness of view; for the body of teachers, better organization: only as we gain in these directions may we hope for substantial growth in our pupils' power to use their mother-tongue.

KATHARINE H. SHUTE.

BOSTON NORMAL SCHOOL.

II. IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS.¹

After the excellent general introduction by Miss Shute, I need to give only a few special words by way of preface to the report on secondary schools.

First of all, I wish to thank between eighty and ninety New England teachers who have kindly taken the time and pains to answer the inquiries of, list No. II so fully and satisfactorily. When we first set about this task some prophets of evil foretold that I should meet with disappointment in my inquiries among the secondary schools, and that my portion of the report would of necessity be theoretical and personal, rather than historical and critical. I confess that I, too, had misgivings, arising in part from a knowledge of the indifference with which a general public is wont to treat circular questions, and I scarcely hoped for half a hundred replies. But I find myself endowed with a veritable embarrassment of riches, consisting of answers from every state in New England, as follows: Maine, 7 reports representing 7 schools; New Hampshire, 9 reports representing 8 schools; Vermont, 2 reports representing two schools; Massachusetts, 22 reports representing 21 schools; Rhode Island, 8 reports representing 6 schools; Connecticut, 6 reports representing 6 schools.

To these I may add a personally solicited report of the Wadleigh High School of New York city—the largest in the world, I think, with an enrollment of about three thousand pupils. There are also, perhaps, a half dozen reports from persons whose names were not appended to their replies, and whose state is therefore uncertain—probably one of absent-mindedness. One of these is postmarked "Back Bay."

I have said that there were 22 replies from Massachusetts. By this I mean the state at large. Besides, there were 32

¹ The list of questions is omitted, as each question is given in connection with its replies.

reports representing 24 schools in Greater Boston, 11 of these coming from 3 public and 3 private schools in Boston proper, not including Roxbury, Dorchester, Charlestown, and such suburban districts even within the city limits.

I note that some of the replies assume that we intend to report on a wider theme than your committee contemplated. We decided to confine our inquiries and suggestions to the somewhat humble but necessary theme of composition, leaving the subject of literature to another committee and a later date. Grammar and rhetoric also, as well as literature, are left out of our scheme of inquiry and recommendation, except where their roots interlace and absolute separation becomes impractical.

One teacher, in submitting a report, says: "One of my pet heresies is, that composition, *as such*, has no place in a high-school curriculum." But as we assume that most of you are orthodox we do not recommend its immediate abolition.

Our committee has held several meetings, and these have been characterized by harmony and substantial concord. Still, it is scarcely to be expected that our reports should agree in all particulars. In the first place, each member is alone responsible for the ideas advanced by him or her; in the second place, the fields traversed by each report are distinct, and need cultivation in peculiar and sometimes radically different ways. The general farmer, the market gardener, and the floriculturist all sow seeds, all sow them in soil, and usually find air, light, and water are helpful in developing the seed into a plant and in bringing the plant to maturity. But they may have different methods of dealing with the vegetable and animal enemies of their different plants, and may have different methods of coaxing and rearing their specialties, according as they are Indian corn, Hubbard squashes, or Lawson pinks.

Lest some members may have forgotten to bring their lists of questions, I will read each before submitting the report thereon. I will also premise that no question was intended to be a leading one, and that when alternative methods were suggested, an effort was made not to reveal the writer's own preference, if, indeed, he had one. It was farthest from his desire

to act like the prestidigitateur and cause his victim to draw a forced card. He has been impressed by the spirit of general interest and the evident frankness of the replies. He has been encouraged by such remarks as "Good idea;" "Never have; but I mean to;" "I never thought of it: it seems a valuable suggestion," and the like. It is quite unimportant if some of those "good ideas" for which he was presumed to stand sponsor did not meet with his unqualified approval. Such remarks betoken interest and sympathy on the parts of the respondents, and it is only when we have a community of interests and a vital sympathy with each other's needs, that this association will be in the highest sense profitable. The first question upon list No. II is as follows: "During how many years is English taught as a specific subject?" Almost without exception English is taught specifically throughout the courses of all the schools heard from; but their courses vary in length. They are 3, 4, 5, and in a few cases 6 years.

The second question is: (a) "On an average, how many recitation periods per week are devoted to the teaching of English?" (b) "What proportion of this (also on an average) is devoted to composition, and what proportion to literature?" The answers to the first part (the number of periods per week) present a wide variety; 2, 2+, 2½, 3, 3½, 4, 4½, 5, and in extreme cases 10 and even 20. Possibly in the latter case reference was made to all recitations conducted in the *English language*! The second part—the relative proportion of composition to literature—is answered, $\frac{1}{5}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, and $\frac{2}{3}$ composition, the smaller fractions being more numerous. In many cases the amount of composition lessens as the course proceeds. This seems necessary in order to comply with the college requirements in English literature, but I think many colleges wish that the proportions were half and half.

The third question is, "How often do you have written work?" The replies are: "Daily;" "Three to four times a week;" "Every one or two days;" "Two or three times a week;" "Every Friday;" "Irregularly;" "Very often;" "Once in two weeks;" "Once in four weeks;" "Always in composition classes; in others once in six weeks."

Questions 4, 5, and 6 may well be considered together because of the extreme range of the answers. The latter sweeps through the whole diapason, chromatics and all. The questions are: (4) "About what proportion of the written work is done outside the class-room?" (5) "Of written work in the class-room, what proportion is impromptu?" (6) "Are your pupils often encouraged to write with the thought of a specific audience?" The extreme replies to 4 are: "Practically all;" "Almost none." To 5 they are: "Most of it;" "Very little." And to 6: "Rarely;" "Always."

Question No. 7 reads, "How is the written work of your pupils corrected?" The replies are full of suggestion and interest. There seems to be a fair unanimity of method, but by common consent it is not the best method. Almost no teachers make the mistake of actually correcting the errors and relieving the pupils of all thought; most of them indicate with colored ink or pencil the sort of error and the general location and leave the pupil to find the rest for himself. A favored few meet the student in personal conference. In addition to criticisms like the above by the teacher a fair per cent. of the schools have more or less of class criticism.

No. 8. "What are your views on the value or personal conference in the correction of compositions?" evoked replies more nearly unanimous than any other question on the list. Here are a few, and *ex pede Herculem*. "Absolutely essential to the highest success. Practically impossible because the number of pupils and hours of recitation." "Absolutely necessary. Next best thing, extended written criticism returned with the exercise." "The nearer instruction in composition comes to a personal conference on each theme, the nearer it approaches the ideal." "Theoretically, personal conference seems to me the only satisfactory solution of certain problems in secondary school English. Practically, 212 pupils and 28 recitations have hitherto precluded the possibility of my making any test." And so *ad finem*.

The answers to No. 9, "Is corrected work, as a rule, entirely re-written?" disclose a decided difference, not only of method

but of opinion. Many have their pupils rewrite all as a rule. Many have that which is below grade rewritten. Some forcibly object to the rewriting of corrected work on the ground that it is drudgery for the pupil. We may remark in passing, that if the pupil could be heard, he would sometimes call it drudgery to write the first draft.

No. 10 is, "Are the subjects for themes chosen mainly from literature or from experience?" Generally speaking there seems to be a fairly equal division between experience and literature. The majority seem to devote more time to experience at the beginning of the course and to literature toward the end. This is doubtless because of the approaching college examinations. A few schools have *no* themes chosen from experience. Happily, however, they are in a small minority. One teacher says: "We try to combine experience and literature as in 'Sir Rogerly de Coveley at a Polo Game.'" One or two others begin with literature and broaden to experience later. This seems rather like inverting natural processes. Just as fingers were made before forks, so experiences come before spelling-books.

I am a little surprised at the number of negative answers to No. 11 — "Do you often have compositions in the form of reports of recitations, debates, parties, concerts, sermons, or speeches?" Over a score give an unqualified "No." Others say "Hardly *often*;" "Seldom;" "Rarely;" "Sometimes;" "Occasionally." One teacher says: "We have not dared to touch on some of these, and the others have been lacking for our use." At first I was puzzled to see the meaning of this reply; but later reflection led me to conclude that the *Siège Perilous* in which no one dared sit was either at the sermon or at the party, and that the concert was lacking. But my question did not expect replies that reports were *regularly* made on *all* these subjects. Parties, concerts, sermons, etc., were given as specimens of entertainments or gatherings, some of which all students enjoy, or at least attend, and a proper account of which would be interesting to others who have not been present. Some practice in telling what one has seen — making others see through one's own

eyes—is good training. It is thus that journalists are made. In this way the imagination is cultivated, too, so that an expert reporter who was not at the Vanderbilt dinner with Prince Henry can write an account as edifying as if he had been a favored guest.

No. 12. "Do you often interchange compositions with the pupils of other schools for mutual criticism?" This question was answered by an almost universal "No." Some seem a little irritated by the question. One writes: "The value of criticism by the class seems to me questionable. My own experience does not confirm the truth of the statement that a correction by a classmate has more effect than many by the teacher." In reply to the last opinion I will say in passing that no such statement was expressed or implied in the question, and the framer of the question never heard the statement made categorically. But within a month a teacher of Greek has told him an interesting incident in this connection. He has repeatedly said to his class that if they would learn the principal parts of certain Greek verbs and the meaning of certain prepositions, they would be fitted to take the average Harvard examination in Attic Greek at sight. Day after day he repeated this opinion, but it seemed to gain small credence. At last one day a pupil nodded at the teacher's trite remark. "Do you believe it?" asked the teacher triumphantly. "Yes," said the boy; "I asked a fellow who had taken the examinations, and he said it was so." Now, the teacher had had phenomenal success in fitting boys for Harvard for many years in many examinations; but the pupil refused to be convinced except on the testimony of one of his peers whose experience extended over but one examination.

Another reply to the question concerning exchange of compositions, reads: "No opportunity." Another: "I never have. I wish the committee would tell of the methods and success of those who have." I will briefly answer the last two correspondents.

All that is needed by way of opportunity is a teacher who is willing to co-operate and about ten cents in stamps. I have exchanged twice during the past term—once with a teacher in

the city, once with a teacher at some little distance. This was our method: On a given day, fixed two or three weeks in advance, our pupils wrote in the class for thirty-five minutes on the same topic without notes. For the previous two or three weeks, however, they had had opportunity to work up their theme if they wished. Both subjects were taken from literature, for especial reasons. One was very simple—"Mr. Burchell." The other was rather difficult, and one that some colleges would not approve: "Child Influence as Exhibited in *The Princess* and in *Silas Marner*." The latter theme tested the power of comparison and the ability to think straight on the part of each pupil. The results justified the theory that some pupils in our high schools need not be confined to description, narration, and summary.

With the compositions (which were identified by numbers, not by names) each teacher sent his estimate of the probable order of excellence, judging from the past work of the pupils. Then the presumably best composition of one class was given to the presumably best writer of the other class for criticism. The critics then made both general and special criticisms. Special criticisms were written in the margins; general criticisms were written on separate sheets. Each pupil then marked his estimate of value on a scale from a A to F, and all papers were re-exchanged.

As to the success: (1), there was great interest manifested on both occasions, and my pupils emulated Oliver Twist in clamoring for more; (2) I was surprised at the discrimination shown by all classes in their general criticisms. It made me feel a becoming humility to think that I sat in daily judgment over boys who could point out so unerringly a bit of bad logic, a lack of coherence, a mass of mere verbiage, a digression, or a platitude. But I found a bit of consolation now and then when I detected them violating their own canons, as Richard Grant White so often does in his *Words and Their Uses*; (3) I have seen a marked improvement in some directions in which one class scored mine severely—that of punctuation especially. One incident of the exchanges interested me very much. I

gave one of the best and one of worst of a set of compositions received to one of the best critics in my class. He showed his discrimination by marking the former A and the latter E, and in the general criticism of the latter he hanged, drew, and quartered him, and then flayed him alive. The teacher wrote me that the victim wanted the critic's scalp, but he got something better. A month later I asked the teacher what the result of the merciless criticism had been upon his pupil. He replied earnestly: "Extend my thanks to No. 4. He has done in one criticism what I have vainly tried to accomplish in four years. He has stung that fellow's pride. He is actually trying to do something, and is succeeding. His penmanship has improved within a month so that it is hardly recognizable, and he is doing better in every way. The other teacher with whom I exchanged seems equally well pleased, and has proposed that another year we organize a syndicate of exchanges among those interested.

As to question 13—"Do you have spoken compositions"—the few affirmative replies betoken a lack of system. One of the best and most helpful runs as follows: "Yes, regularly in all classes. Four are appointed from each class each week to speak three minutes without notes on a subject of their own choosing. These are criticised by pupils and instructor. The instructor often reads from Higginson's *Hints on Speechmaking* and Brander Matthews's *Notes* on the same subject. No exercise interests the pupils more." I will add that I have pursued a method in many respects similar to that just given, and I find the talks furnish an excellent subject for ten-minute themes in the form of criticisms upon the speakers. I read the criticisms aloud, concealing the writer's name, and thus each speaker is stimulated to win the praise and avoid the censure of his comrades. I then correct the criticisms as I would any other composition.

No. 14: "Is careful attention given to the correction of spoken English." Here the ayes have it. Almost everybody says "Yes," and bold indeed were he who would cry "Hold! enough!" Yet I must agree with Miss Shute's ideas upon this same theme, and commend what she says to the consideration

of the secondary-school teacher. I have one unique reply, however, which may be of interest: "No. Our students whose English needs correction are in the minority. They soon become conscious of their errors and correct themselves. The result is usually all that could be desired. It seems to me that in view of these conditions, to correct in class a student's spoken English would be unkind to the student and unjust to the class."

No. 15: "Do teachers in the other departments co-operate with the English teacher?" Several say "Yes," but I am inclined to think the reply is to be taken in a Pickwickian sense. Other answers are evasive, as "Constantly urged to do so;" "Probably as much as in most schools;" "To some degree;" "Our principal encourages and requests it." Others are mildly sarcastic, as, "They mean to, but they forget it;" "We hope they will in time;" "All are expected to." And still others say bluntly: "Give very little help;" "Some do; I think that some do not;" "Inadequately and intermittently;" "They have been urged to, and appealed to in every way, but they respond only in a faint-hearted fashion;" "I am of the opinion that the English department is the only place where there is any attempt to teach English; I know poor English translations are accepted in Latin." And lastly: "No: on the contrary they are inclined to hold the English department responsible for all errors in English found in their work."

No. 16: "Are compositions often read before the class? If so, by pupil or by teacher?" I think there is but one unqualified "*No*"—implying, perhaps, that they are never read. Most teachers have them read with more or less frequency; some always by the pupils; some always by the teacher; while others try both methods.

Nos. 17, 18 and 19 were printed on the *verso* of the sheet and were unobserved by several, and consequently unanswered. Still a goodly number turned the leaf and took the trouble to reply.

No. 17 reads as follows: "Do you make a practice of taking a secret ballot to determine the best composition of several read before the class? If so, do you find the class opinion

generally coincides with your own?" I frankly confess that I expected a grand symphony of "Noes." I scarcely knew a teacher that practiced the ballot or favored it. Yet I believe it to be of the utmost value, if not carried to an extreme, both as a stimulus to the ambition of the writers on whom a class judgment will be passed, and as a training of the judgment of the individual voters. For the class usually votes right (*i.e.*, according to my judgment), and the voter who votes wrong writes himself down as uncritical—and no one knows it but himself. In both of the exchanges of which I have spoken, my class by a large majority selected the compositions of the other classes which the teachers of those classes said were probably the best. That was also, I consider, a great compliment to the judgment of each of those teachers, for I feel sure my class was right. One of their votes was most striking. The compositions of the rival class were separated into three parts, and after they were read before the class a vote was taken to determine the best in each division. In two out of the three cases the teacher's estimate was confirmed. In the other case, they disagreed, and here very possibly the class judgment was at fault. But when the three best according to their selection were read one after the other, the vote for the boy whose composition his teacher presumed was best, was almost unanimous.

Coming now to the replies to question 17, I find that, though the custom of balloting is by no means a common one, it is found in every state of New England with but one exception, and from that state I have received but two replies. The last fact in itself is significant. I read a few of the answers: "Not secret; no time. Classes generally find the best; always the worst. They can usually tell whether the writer is a boy or a girl. The name of the author is always concealed." "No. I mean to try. I fancy from the unwritten votes I see in their faces that I should find their opinion coincided with my own." (a) "Secret ballot when papers have been read by the writer; oral vote when the authorship is concealed." (b) "Nearly always." "Not as a practice. I have done so occasionally." (a) "I do frequently." (b) "Yes, almost invariably." (a)

"Often." (b) "Always, almost, though I try not to show my preference." So let the good work go on.

Nos. 18 and 19 are questions as perennial as Tennyson's brook, and were asked, not with the thought that the answers could be codified, but rather with the purpose of stimulating the thought of each member of this association so that after the report there might be a vigorous discussion. By way of summary I will give a few of my own convictions, and they may also pass as personal replies to Nos. 18 and 19, which read as follows: (18) "In what lines of English teaching in secondary schools do you think there is greatest need of improvement?"—To this I should reply, In the practice of composition (not the theory) and in the teaching of literature. (19) "Please state in less than one hundred words some of the ways in which such improvements may be effected."

I shall not limit myself to a hundred words, shall say nothing of the teaching of literature directly, and shall treat of both the theory and practice of composition in my closing thoughts. There is little time for arguments, so I shall confine myself mainly to conclusions, numbering them to correspond with the questions upon the list.

1. English composition should be taught throughout the secondary-school course.

2. This should occupy some part of at least three recitation periods of each week. The time devoted to composition, either spoken or written, should be equal to that devoted to literature.

3. There should be daily practice in the careful writing of English. When the specific English recitation does not occur each day, a translation into good English from some foreign language, a history test, or the like, will serve to keep the pupil in trim.

4. Until the pupil has learned how to compose, but little work should be assigned to be done outside the class-room. Some should be assigned, no doubt; just enough to avoid going to extremes.

5. Of work done in the class, the greater part in the early years should be work relative to the pupil's experience, or that

in which the material is furnished him. It should be work in which thoughts are not so much needed as words. Toward the close of the course, much writing should be absolutely impromptu—both as to thought and as to expression.

6. Pupils should always write expecting somebody to read and judge what they have written. It is well, for variety's sake, not to have the same audience in mind day after day. Novelty always enchains the interest of the child.

7. The impression should never prevail that work is not to be inspected or valued. There is not time to mark all themes that should be written; but all themes should be returned to the writer for careful preservation during the year, and at least one of every two or three should be carefully marked for revision. The writer should be encouraged to revise the others himself.

8. Personal conference should be secured, as all agree that that is the only perfect method.

9. Much of the corrected work should be entirely rewritten, but not all, except in certain years. By having frequent short themes, each may be rewritten if necessary, without imposing a seeming hardship upon the pupil.

10. Subjects for themes should not be chosen exclusively either from literature or from experience. The proportions should vary at different stages of the pupil's career. If possible, divide them about equally.

11. Reports of various sorts furnish valuable training. *Reporters* report constantly, and the twentieth century newspapers will need many reporters.

12. The interchange of compositions with writers in other schools gives a healthful and natural interest to composition.

13. Spoken compositions are no less valuable than written, and excite far more enthusiasm.

14. Spoken English should be corrected according to some system.

15. Every possible pressure—moral, physical, and political—should be brought to bear upon the teachers of all other departments to induce them to co-operate with the English teacher.

16. Compositions should be read frequently, even generally,

before the class; sometimes by the pupil, sometimes by the teacher. Class criticism should follow, and pupils should be taught that criticism means, not censure, but judgment.

17. The secret ballot, showing the class judgment of the best themes, should be employed much more widely, but not overdone. It is a valuable aid to the teacher and a valuable training for all the class. It teaches pupils to weigh and consider. It stimulates each writer to do his very best, knowing that his peers will dispense even-handed justice and give victory to whom victory is due, honor to whom honor.

D. O. S. LOWELL.

ROXBURY, MASS., LATIN SCHOOL.

III. IN THE COLLEGE.

LIST NO. 3: QUESTIONS FOR COLLEGES.

1. How many hours of required work are there in English composition and rhetoric as distinguished from literature?
2. How many hours of elective work?
3. How often do you have written work, (a) prepared outside class, (b) done in class?
4. To what extent are theme subjects taken (a) from the literature studied? (b) from the student's daily life, observation, and experience? (c) from work done in other departments of the college exclusive of the English department?
5. How much time is given to the reading of themes in class? Is the reading done by the instructor or by the student?
6. Are the themes written with reference to a specific audience suggested by the instructor or chosen by the student?
7. In the early work of the course is facility or correctness made the immediate aim?
8. To what extent is the entire rewriting of themes required?
9. What amount of time per month is given by the instructor to personal conference with individual students on the written work?
10. Have you courses in which the problems of English composition are considered with reference to training students who intend to teach English in the secondary schools?
11. Along what lines do you see most need of improvement in the English teaching of your college?
12. What recommendations have you to send back to teachers of English in the preparatory schools fitting for your college?

The study of English in the colleges has, within the past decade, become increasingly satisfactory. In several of the smaller colleges, and in one of the great universities, the work has been reorganized and a more generous allowance of time given. It is noteworthy that Harvard, Columbia, and Vassar still lead in giving English in the curriculum a place commensurate with its importance, providing five hours of required work, and a large amount of elective work. It has been the misfortune of English that it has not had the status of any other full course in the hours assigned it, that it has been, and is still

in many colleges, tucked into a student's programme as an insignificant adjunct to other work. The student is apt to take his measure of the importance of a subject from the prominence given it by the faculty, and to treat as a pretty, useless frill a subject merely sandwiched in between others which demanded of him more lengthy consideration, and which, in the coin of his realm, count for more toward a degree. Some colleges have not passed the point where, as Professor Barrett Wendell has said, the English teacher, like the dancing-master, is regarded as a kind of ornamental appendage to the serious course of study.

The root of the difficulty lies in the fact that the disciplinary importance of English has not been properly recognized. So long as English is merely an adjunct, a means of saving instructors in other departments work which they should do themselves, in insisting on proper form in their written papers, so long will it be merely a side issue on the curriculum. The true function of English teaching, as I conceive it, is to teach a student to *organize* his experience and knowledge for expression. There is nothing that taxes human intelligence so severely as this very process of organization; it involves clear, precise thinking; it involves a nice perception of relations of one thing with all the other things in one's universe. English teaching in college suffers somewhat from the incubus which weighs on the secondary school even more deadeningly — the incubus of formal rhetoric. Instead of teaching our students names, classifications, an elaborate nomenclature of logical distinctions, we need to teach them a few, a very few, basic principles of thought-organization. We need principles, and the application of principles to the matter in hand, and we need this done over and over again until the principles have sunken into the subconsciousness of the student and are used by him almost automatically. If we could get into the heads of students in our college classes what unity, emphasis, and coherence mean; if we could make them see that these are organizing principles of human thought everywhere, in all the fine arts, in music, painting, sculpture, architecture; if we could make them realize that they are

fundamental wherever human intelligence seeks outward expression, we should do something for our students that would count eternally in their development. The task of the English teacher is to teach students *to think*, to think in orderly processes, to supply the student with principles for testing thought. This is not exciting work, and the student does not "take to it" as the traditional duck takes to water, but it is the business of the English teacher, by infinite variety of resources, to instil these basic principles until they are mastered. Instead of this, what we have in much of our college work, even in the Freshman class, is detailed classification of kinds of description — subjective, objective, dynamic, kinetic, intensive, and a dozen more. In narration, instead of the simple laws of development, we have the whole theory of the technique of the drama, with charts, and diagrams, and arches, and hypersubtleties of all sorts, and then, to cap the climax, we have the complete psychology of style unfolded to the freshman mind in its virgin innocence. English teachers in college try to present in the freshman year the material and results given them in their graduate work; English teachers in the secondary schools try to transplant college courses *in toto* to their new classroom; neither is content with the plain duty near at hand, but seeks self-exploitation and artificial interest by the use of matter unadapted to the needs of students. I believe, in short, that the next ten years will see a great simplification of the subject-matter of English taught in the secondary school and in college; that heads of departments will insist on the unloading in the elementary courses of about half the material that now encumbers them; that there will be a return to basic principles for testing thought, and form as it is related to thought. There is time enough to teach freshmen the art of fiction, and the technique of the drama, and the psychology of style, when they have learned that two absolutely unrelated statements may not be connected by *and* and thrust into a single sentence.

I have put stress on the necessity of teaching a few basic principles or laws of thought, because they must ever be the balance-wheel for the mass of new perceptions which it is the

highest privilege of an English instructor to evoke in his students. The English instructor should stimulate, should help awaken the imagination, should attune the senses to a finer and more delicate registering of the experience of living. It is for just such a purpose that I should recommend a great increase in the number of short themes assigned (commonly known as daily themes), for they call for an immediate, personal, vivid reaction on daily life with its crisscross and play of interests, suggestion, and feeling. Since the function of teaching English is to teach self-expression, to teach the student to organize and phrase his perception of life, he should be sent to that material which is warmest and closest, which he will unconsciously put forth with most intimate knowledge. English composition can never be vital until it trains the student to select his *own* material from that which life brings, making his selection along the line of personal interest. As soon as English can be liberated from the tyranny of set subjects taken from literature, where the object is the mechanical reproduction of the ideas of another, we shall begin to have work that is worth while. A good many of the freshmen who come to Wellesley have no idea of writing on anything but Hamlet's madness or the evils of jealousy as seen in Othello, or Satan as the hero of *Paradise Lost*, or friendship, with pitiful pilfering from Emerson. A subject of less magnitude is unworthy of their infant prowess; they who have been used to scaling the walls of Olympus lustily rebel at the pedestrian task of giving an account of some simple incident of the day. They are tongue-tied and helpless unless the material of ideas is taken more or less bodily from a book and given back under a thin disguise of rephrasing. And we call writing on such subjects self-expression! I do not of course mean that subjects from literature necessarily call only for the ideas of another, but wish rather to emphasize the obvious truth that in the freshman and sophomore years the student's spontaneity does not naturally play about subjects taken from literature; that therefore it is better to keep these subjects in subordination. In the later years of the course, subjects from literature have much more a rightful place, for there is, as the student

matures, a growing catholicity of taste and an aptitude for ideas as ideas; in the earlier years, however, consistent effort should be made to keep the subjects for short and long themes humanly rather than pedagogically interesting. Professor G. R. Carpenter, of Columbia, writes:

Theme subjects are taken almost entirely from matters lying within the student's experience. We have not secured good results from making the work in literature the basis of composition. My feeling is that such a union of two different kinds of work is likely to be successful only in the junior and senior years.

Of the colleges sending information on this point, Harvard, Columbia, Cornell, the Institute of Technology, Brown, Williams, Tufts, Amherst, Vassar, and Wellesley report that theme subjects are practically all taken, in the earlier years of the course, from subjects based on the students' experience.

A recommendation to which I attach much importance is that more time be given in class to the reading and discussing themes by the instructor, and more particularly by the student. It is incredible to suppose that themes dropped into a box and read in private by an elder and returned to the student in private will have the same significance as themes which are to pass muster before a student's comrades, which are to raise or lower him in the esteem of those who constitute his world. A wise instructor cannot neglect to utilize the social instinct which makes us all eager to stand well in the eyes of our little world, which makes communication to an audience of our fellows a real and vital thing. Such class discussion will stimulate better work in the students by lifting the act of writing from a mechanical exercise to a human utterance to one's fellows. Besides that, it will be the means of testing and applying to ever-varying material the cardinal touchstones or principles of thought-organization which it is the business of the English instructor to inculcate. Statistics as to the amount of time actually given in the classroom to the reading of themes, in answer to the question sent out, have been too vague and unsatisfactory to tabulate. Some colleges report "a considerable amount of time," whatever that may mean. The statements from Harvard, Columbia,

Cornell, the Institute of Technology, Brown, Amherst, Tufts, Smith, Vassar, and Wellesley, seem to indicate that from one-half to one-third of the time given to English in the classroom is devoted to comment on themes read aloud. Reports from several other colleges seem to show very little class discussion of themes. One-third is certainly a low enough time allowance for this part of the work. Our composition teaching, as I said a moment ago, is suffering from too much theory, from too little practical application to the matter in hand. No instructor can ever be sure that his students are not bandying about mere terms and empty names until they are put to the test of criticising themes. It would seem, perhaps, a fairer distribution if one-half the time in class were given to the presentation of a new body of facts, or to outlining new modes of work; if the other half were given to the discussion and testing of the results in composition. The emphasis at present falls in such a way as to lead one to suppose that we solemnly teach rhetoric as an end in itself rather than as means to composition. In no art school does the time spent on the theory preponderate, as in rhetoric teaching, over the actual practice and criticism of results. In painting and drawing, it is acknowledged that the student learns by *doing*; in English composition, it seems to be supposed that the student learns by copious advice as to how to do. In every studio where artists are learning to paint, it is admitted by common consent, that the criticism of results by the master and fellow-students is the most valuable and significant part of the training. Why should this not be true in the art of English composition?

It will not seem extravagant to suggest that almost one-half the time in the English class be given to the reading and discussion of themes, if it is borne in mind that another important end is thereby achieved. It is very evident from college freshmen that they have not been trained to rewrite themes in the sense of reconceiving, in a new and larger spirit, the matter presented. They will recopy themes, correcting specific mistakes indicated, but they seem curiously fettered by the finality of the written word in making radical and complete changes. The discussion of themes in class, if wisely conducted, will throw

new points of view on the matter as well as the form ; will enable the student to re-envisage his material, will send him away eager to reconstitute it in the larger, more pregnant relations which the discussion has revealed. It is because of this profound conviction that the class discussion of themes is the best means of teaching rhetorical principles, the best means of training taste and critical acumen, the only means of stimulating students to an intelligent reconceiving and reshaping of material, that the claim for half the time in the English hour is made for it. Reports from several of the leading colleges indicate that from sixty to seventy-five per cent. of the themes are entirely rewritten. In the last two years of the high school, and throughout the college course, the average student should be taught to expect to rewrite about half his work. The criticism that fails to make pressingly evident the need of the total reconstruction of a theme must fall short somewhere or rest content with comfortably mediocre attainment. In my own advanced elective work, I count practically on every long theme being rewritten. As a student advances in his work, the infinite possibilities of betterment in his writing should make constant and eager challenge to him.

The colleges themselves proclaim, as one of their greatest needs, more time set apart by the English instructor for personal conference with his students. In the high school, the need is more importunate, though on the whole there is far less provision for it than in the colleges. Most of the colleges of first rank follow the practice of Harvard in arranging that an instructor shall have conferences with each individual student in his written work at least once a fortnight. It is suggested by the head of one of the leading English departments that a fair allowance of time is to assign each college instructor six or eight hours a week of conference with students for every two hours of class appointment. Probably the best and most valuable work of the English instructor is done in talking over the themes of a student in personal conference. A single searching question can set straight in a moment some point of defective analysis ; the inflection of the voice can reveal a whole new point

of view as no set of written symbols can. It is to be earnestly hoped that the colleges will make more generous provision for this part of the English work.

The general recommendation made to the colleges, namely: (1) that there should be emancipation from so many set subjects drawn from literature, and should be more themes based on daily life and observation; (2) that there should be increase in the time given to the reading and discussion of themes to the extent of making this one-half, or at least one-third, of the whole time in class; (3) that there should be a great increase in the requirement of rewritten work; (4) that there should be set apart for the English instruction, as a necessary part of the work, as necessary as the laboratory to the instructor in science, five or eight hours a week for conference with individual students on their work—these recommendations, I say, should be passed on to the secondary schools too. If they were carried out in the secondary schools, the need for them in college would be far less. The college must now supply in part the deficiency in secondary-school teaching. There are some specific pieces of work crying aloud to heaven to be done in the secondary school. For instance, there is no reason whatever why, in a class of 175 freshmen, only about twenty-five should know how to write and punctuate the headings of an ordinary letter. Freshmen are amazingly and grotesquely ignorant of the simplest rules. They will, in writing a note to a college instructor to explain a late theme, address the instructor as "Kind Friend," with no sense that there is anything provincial in such a salutation. Is it not a clear injustice to the great mass of students who never get beyond the high schools to send them forth into the world without knowledge of the most practical points in English that they are called upon to use in the business of life? Letter forms and punctuation have to be done year after year with successive freshman classes in colleges, though both should have been disposed of in the grammar school. But the plea for teaching punctuation and letter forms becomes a faint echo before the clamor that English grammar be more efficiently handled in the secondary schools. The colleges with unvarying

insistence repeat that a more intelligent grasp of the elements of English grammar is most desired of the entering freshmen. I quote from a few letters sent in answer to the question, "What recommendations have you to send back to teachers of English in the preparatory schools fitting for your college?" From Mr. Seaver, of the Institute of Technology, comes the answer:

More explicit instruction in grammar. The commonest violations of mere correctness I encounter are grammatical errors, due chiefly, I think, to hazy ideas about grammar in general. For instance, 50 per cent. of my pupils insist that in such a sentence as "There were three men," *there* is the subject of *were*; and if you ask them what part of speech *there* is, they ask you what you mean by part of speech.

Another correspondent writes:

The pupils may remember the dates of Longfellow's birth and death; they are confident that they once studied a book on rhetoric that had something in it about figures of speech, that they have read the *Merchant of Venice* and the *Lady of the Lake* and some other books — they are not sure what. But they can't tell a sentence from an adverbial clause; they begin each sentence upon a new line; their idea of unity resembles the spokes of a cart-wheel. I recommend that the preparatory-school teachers of English burn up the text-books *about* literature and devote the little time at their disposal to a more thorough study of the books *of* literature; that they spend less time on text-books of rhetoric and more on practice in composition; and that, if they are eligible, they take at the first opportunity the Harvard Summer School course entitled English A.

Professor Ganung of Amherst says:

There ought to be more drill in simple English grammar, and a more vital, less exclusively mechanical, approach to the work of composition.

Professor Maxcey of Williams College reinforces the thought in this statement:

The pupils should give more attention to the principles of grammar and less to the critical side of literature. The boys who come up to college are in the great majority of cases lamentably deficient in the simplest principles of grammar, while they can give all sorts of information about simile and metaphor. It is of more importance to be able to write intelligently "It is he" instead of "It is him," and give a rational explanation why one is preferable to the other, than to know the difference between metonymy and synchdoche, or to know the difference between folio and quarto editions of Shakespeare. I refrain from giving you instances of the wholesale ignorance regarding grammatical principles and the essentials of sentence structure as

illustrated by incoming freshmen, for you would have no confidence in my veracity.

Professor Damon of Brown urges that the preparatory schools —

spend less time on things the college is supposed to teach, and more time on elementary matters, that we may not receive, duly equipped with a certificate, students whose grammar is wholly individual, and who are unable to maintain in writing the degree of coherence expected of a man of average intelligence in casual conversation.

Professor Hart of Cornell strikes at the root of our difficulty in his recommendation :

The sorest need is the compelling of good English in other departments; *e. g.*, in languages, history, descriptive science. As long as other departments are content to accept poor writing, they will get it. . . . Our Cornell experience is that the most difficult thing to overcome is the lack of thought. Many of our freshmen seem to believe that anything patched up in grammatical shape will pass for writing. Our chief effort goes to training them to think. Consequently I would urge school teachers to train their scholars to *think*; especially to prepare outlines of composition, before writing the compositions.

Time forbids quoting from the many other interesting communications on this point. The gist of them may perhaps be expressed in the view that the preparatory schools should put far heavier stress on teaching sentence structure, unity as applied to the sentence, and the use of connectives; that they should send up students who actually know the essentials of a paragraph, and know a good paragraph from a bad one; who can trace the logical development of an idea as formulated in a topic sentence through a paragraph, or through a group of paragraphs; who can draw up sensible outlines of their themes as a guide *before* writing; who can detect manifest incoherence in thought or form. The schools have, within the past ten years, done a splendid work in sending up students increasingly well trained; this is our best augury for the future.

SOPHIE CHANTAL HART.

WELLESLEY COLLEGE.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE EIGHTH CLASSICAL CONFERENCE HELD AT ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN, ON MARCH 27 AND 28.

THE Eighth Classical Conference was held at Ann Arbor, Michigan, March 27 and 28, in connection with the annual meeting of the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club. The use of the stereopticon made possible the presentation of a somewhat wider range of subjects than at preceding meetings; and this Conference differed from those of previous years also in the proportion of time given to historical papers. There was a good attendance at all the sessions.

The morning session of Thursday, March 27, was held in the lecture room of the University Museum; the presiding officer was Professor Samuel Ball Platner, of the Western Reserve University. At the afternoon session, held in Newberry Hall, Professor J. C. Jones, of the University of Missouri, presided. In the evening the members of the Conference were invited to attend a lecture given under the auspices of the Michigan Academy of Sciences in University Hall.

On Friday morning, March 28, the members of the Conference were invited to attend a general session of the Schoolmasters' Club, at which were presented two papers of unusual interest to classical teachers, by Professor William Gardner Hale, of the University of Chicago, and Dr. Henry A. Sanders, of the University of Michigan. Friday afternoon a joint session of the Classical and Historical Conferences was held in the lecture room of the Museum; the presiding officer was Professor Richard Hudson, of the University of Michigan. An invitation was extended to all to unite in a special Good Friday Vesper Service in University Hall at five o'clock; the program of passion music, arranged by Professor Albert A. Stanley, was of rare impressiveness. In the evening the members of the conferences were invited to attend a general session of the Schoolmasters' Club in University Hall; Professor Francis W. Kelsey, of the University of

Michigan, gave an illustrated lecture dealing with the recent discoveries at Pompeii.

For convenience of reference the following abstracts of papers and addresses will be numbered in the order of the program. Of the twenty-two papers and addresses three (numbered 16, 17, and 22), as already noted, were presented at general sessions of the Schoolmasters' Club, and five (12, and 18 to 21) at the joint session on Friday afternoon. Five (3, 7, 20, 21, 22) were illustrated by stereopticon slides.

1. "The Making and Use of a Latin Lexicon," by Professor John C. Rolfe, University of Michigan.

A well-made Latin lexicon consists of a series of biographies of words, giving an account of their origin, their growth and development, and in some cases of their death. Many of these throw light not only on the language of the Romans, but on their history as well, using that term in its broadest sense.

A good lexicon-article should treat a word from various points of view:

1. From the historical standpoint, a complete record of its existence should be given, from its earliest appearance to its disappearance from the language, or down to the period which is decided on as limiting the scope of the work. In this field account must be taken of the great mass of literature which has been lost, particularly in the ante-classical period, as well as of the colloquial language, the *sermo cottidianus* and the *sermo plebeius*, as found in certain inscriptions and to some extent in the literature. Much may be inferred which is absent from our records through a careful study of the available material, and from the Romance languages. Particularly interesting is a study of the causes which led to the disappearance of words from the language, and to the substitution of new terms. This point was treated at some length and the belief expressed that the tendency of monosyllabic words, as such, to disappear has been greatly overestimated.

2. From the geographical standpoint: the dialectic differences in the ante-classical and post-classical periods must be taken into account, and the failure of the provincial writers of the classical period to use the language with the correctness and precision of the classicists. The highly artificial character of the *sermo urbanus* in accentuation, vocabulary, and syntax must constantly be regarded.

3. From the etymological and morphological standpoints, including

the derivation of words, questions of orthography and quantity, double forms with or without a difference of signification, and the absence of certain forms.

4. The bulk of a lexicon article deals with semasiology, the study of the changes in meaning of words due to restriction or extension of signification. The fondness of individual writers for certain words, as well as their "verbal taboos," should be considered.

5. We must look to the scientific lexicon for syntactical and stylistic information also. Here, as always, we must keep in mind the historical and geographical points of view, as well as the individual peculiarities of writers, due to the branch of literature which they represent, their degree of education, tendency to innovation or imitation, and the like; also the development of a writer at various stages of his career.

A brief history of Latin lexicography was given, and the problems presented to the makers of special lexicons and of school lexicons were considered. The editor of a school lexicon has in some respects the most difficult task of all, since he must aim at reasonable completeness, must furnish considerable information on antiquities and kindred subjects, and at the same time must furnish a book compact enough to be easily handled, which shall sell for a moderate price.

It was pointed out that our standard lexicon in this country was issued more than twenty years ago and needs a thorough revision. That a revision has not been made is not the fault of the editor, nor is it due to lack of material for the purpose. The real reason is, that large lexicons are not extensively used in this country, and that our students are not as a rule book buyers. The absolute necessity of a good lexicon for teachers in secondary schools and for college students was pointed out in some detail, and the teachers of Latin were appealed to, in the interests of sound and thorough scholarship, as well as for the sake of hastening the day when our present standard lexicon may be thoroughly revised, to encourage the use of large lexicons, and to insist on it when it is necessary.

2. The Prometheus of Æschylus and the Prometheus of Shelley," by Principal J. H. Harris, Michigan Military Academy.

After a general introduction touching upon the main points of similarity and difference familiar to students of the two dramas, Mr. Harris narrowed his study to a comparison of the Zeus and Jupiter respectively of Æschylus and Shelley. The Jupiter of Shelley is the personification of all those laws, institutions, customs and beliefs which,

in his view, oppressed mankind and held it in despotic bonds. This is distinctly avowed in the speech of the Spirit of the Hour at the close of the third act :

And those foul shapes, abhorred by God and man,
Which, under many a name and many a form,
Strange, savage, ghastly, dark and execrable,
Were Jupiter, the Tyrant of this world.

The Zeus of Æschylus, on the other hand, is not an abstraction, he is a person. Everything about him is human, save perhaps his superhuman power. His wrath, his passion, his arbitrary exercise of newly-gained power, his wilfulness, his jealousy—all are vividly impressed upon us. The Zeus of Æschylus is in a choler, a temper, from which he may recover if Prometheus will only yield up the secret. The picture is not of a permanently tyrannical sovereign but of one who has been temporarily baffled and enraged. In proof that Zeus was in a choler—in other words in a bilious mood—Mr. Harris cited the use of the words *χολος* and *δργή* in various passages, notably lines 29 and 30; 312, 313; 375, 376; 190, 191; 378. These passages, not only in the use of the particular words, but in their spirit and form indicate the temporary nature of Zeus's wrath.

Another evidence of the "mood" nature of his anger is to be found in the frequent references to the fact that he is exercising his authority with the temporary arbitrariness and wilfulness of one who has but just come to unlimited and irresponsible sovereignty. In support of this view the following lines were quoted: 35, 36; 95, 96; 148, 149; 310; 389.

In this view of the choleric nature of Zeus's wrath may be found, Mr. Harris ventured to suggest, a possible explanation of the apparent irreverence of Æschylus in his representation of Zeus. It has seemed incomprehensible that Æschylus, a man of profound piety and reverence, should paint Zeus in such harsh colors. It has been hazarded as an explanation that if we had the lost "Prometheus Unbound" we should find this excessive bitterness and harshness removed by a new and more pleasing picture of Zeus than is presented in the "Prometheus Bound." Grote's explanation that Zeus, though of superior power and authority, was still only one of many divinities, and that the ennobling conception of Prometheus outweighed any seeming irreverence toward Zeus, has been received with much favor and has much to commend it. But if we interpret the attitude of Zeus as a wrathful mood which, under more favorable conditions, will subside, we shall

have less difficulty in comprehending Æschylus's use of the vehement and irreverent language which he so frequently employs. Epithets and characterizations may be directed against a person's temporary state of mind or temper which would not be justifiable or pardonable against his general character.

The Jupiter of Shelley, on the other hand, is not in a mood nor is he giving vent to a passion which may soon subside. His is a permanent, unyielding attitude of mind and cannot be changed nor mollified. This was inevitable from the end which Shelley had in view and from the interpretation of his Jupiter which has already been given.

These widely different conceptions of Zeus are the necessary antecedents to the solution which is in the one drama foreshadowed and in the other accomplished. The thought of a sovereign ruler swept away by a temporary fit of passion necessarily anticipates a reconciliation. The conception of a permanently tyrannical sovereign necessarily involves a revolution. Nothing less than the complete overthrow of Jupiter would satisfy the lines on which Shelley's drama is constructed or the *motif* which underlies it. Reconciliation would be as illogical as it was impossible.

3. "The De Criscio Collection of Latin Inscriptions," by Professor Walter Dennison, Oberlin College.

This paper was illustrated by fifty stereopticon slides, made from original negatives by Principal George R. Swain.

"In the spring of 1897," said Professor Dennison, "I made several visits to the magazzino of Ab. Giuseppe de Criscio, the parish priest of Pozzuoli, Italy, who for many years had been a diligent collector of the Latin and Greek inscriptions found in the vicinity of Pozzuoli. The text of his inscriptions he had for the most part communicated to the editors of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, as the tenth volume of that publication testifies; in the preface to the volume he is mentioned as one of the contributors. During one of my visits he confided to me his desire to dispose of all his inscriptions to some educational institution which would keep the collection intact. Upon my return to America, I mentioned the matter to Mr. Henry P. Glover, of Ypsilanti, Mich., who immediately offered to arrange for the purchase of the collection and for its transportation to Ann Arbor. The inscriptions now form a part of the archæological equipment of the University of Michigan."

The collection includes not far from 275 pieces, and is fairly representative of the most important classes of inscriptions.

There are, first, *inscriptiones sacrae*, one addressed to the Penates, another to *Jupiter Optimus Maximus*, and still another to the *numen Augusti*. Several are *tituli operum publicorum*, two of them mentioning the office of the *duoviri*. By far the greater number are, as one would expect, sepulchral inscriptions. There are over two hundred of these, and they illustrate practically all types, giving a wide range of modes of expression, abbreviations, and proper names, and throwing light upon many points in private life and family relationship. Among the most interesting is a small slab set up with a rude metrical inscription in memory of a child who had not yet completed "four times seven months."

There is a large number of *tituli militares*, epitaphs of sailors who had been connected with the imperial fleet stationed at Misenum. They are of unusual interest and value. One gives the name of a *munus classiarium* hitherto unknown.

This collection also furnishes material for the study of the forms of Latin letters, from the end of the republic to the fifth century A. D. They show cursive letters, as well as both forms of monumental capitals, the *scriptura monumentalis* and the *scriptura actuarial*. They illustrate the *I-longa* and *apices*; in one case a point is placed over the long vowel, indicating its length. Divisions of syllables by points also occur. Those which throw light upon disputed cases are S·C (thus divided) and S·T.

To the De Criscio collection belong also several brick stamps and a dozen sections of lead pipe bearing inscriptions, besides two terracotta ash urns, one of which is dated by the name of the consul of the current year.

The collection includes about a dozen Greek inscriptions, most of which are sepulchral. One of them is metrical, written in the hexameter verse, and is Homeric in style. Another gives us Latin words cut with Greek letters. This is of special interest because of the way in which long vowels, especially *ē* and *ō*, are transliterated. The relative pronoun *qui* is transliterated **KOYE**. A third inscription, relating to the importation into Puteoli of a strange eastern goddess, has attracted the attention of the French epigraphist, Professor Cognat, who has recently edited it with comment in the *Comptes Rendus* of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.

The value of the collection is great from a scientific point of view, but still greater from the pedagogical point of view, as an adjunct to advanced university work in the classics.

4. "Some Questions of Word-Order and Cadence in their Bearing on the Authorship of the Pseudo-Cæsarian Writings," by Dr. Clarence Linton Meader, University of Michigan.

This paper, which, on account of the length of the program, was read by title, will be published in full later.

5. "Quintilian on Extempore Speaking in the Light of Later Teaching," by Professor George V. Edwards, Olivet College.

This paper is printed in full; see p. 396.

6. Dido—A Character Sketch," by Mr. J. Raleigh Nelson, Léwis Institute, Chicago.

This paper was an attempt at a sympathetic interpretation of Dido's character as presented in the fourth book of Virgil's *Æneid*. It will be published in full later.

7. "Classic Sites in Sicily," by Professor Benjamin L. D'Ooge, Michigan State Normal College.

Professor D'Ooge gave a lecture illustrated by views which he had gathered during a recent trip through the island. After a brief introduction on the history of Sicily under the successive rule of the Greeks, Carthaginians, and Romans, views were shown of the following important classical localities: Catana, Tauromenium, Syracuse, Agrigentum, Segesta, Selinus, Lilybaeum, Drepanum, Eryx, Panormus, Himera, Tyndaris, and Messana, with neighboring Scylla and Charybdis.

8. "An Ancient Misogynist," by Professor F. S. Goodrich, Albion College.

After an introduction treating of the position of woman in general in the Greek world, Professor Goodrich showed, by means of quotations from the dramas of Euripides, why it is that this poet has been called a misogynist. He subjected several of the adverse citations to criticism, proving that if read in close relation with the context they cannot be fairly taken as representing the poet's own opinion. Finally he brought forward a convincing series of quotations of an altogether different tenor, reaching the conclusion that Euripides' ideal of womanhood, as revealed in various characters, was very high; and that no writer who could give such marvelous delineations of female character could justly be called a misogynist.

9. "Greek and Runic Letters and Numbers," by Professor George Hempl, University of Michigan.

Professor Hempl made a brief report on the progress of his investigations into the early history of the Runes, the first letters used by our Teutonic ancestors. These studies have of late taken an important turn, which not only establishes beyond all question Professor Hempl's contention that the Runes are a Western Greek alphabet that came to the Teutons between 600 and 550 B. C., but also reveals an unsuspected Teutonic numerical notation. In this, α — ι represented 1—10, and κ — ξ stood for 20—60 as in Greek, while π — ψ , the last nine letters of the Western Greek alphabet not being needed in the Teutonic sexagesimal-decimal system, were employed to represent 11—19, leaving *omicron* as a sign for the remaining high number, the *hund* or long hundred (120). This notation reveals important facts, not only as to the character of the Teutonic numerical system and the time of the Teutonic shift of consonants, but also as to the development of the numerical notation of the Greeks. Professor Hempl's studies will soon be published in full in *Indogermanische Forschungen*, the *Classical Review*, and the *Journal of Germanic Philology*.

10. "Notes on Horace," by Professor Wallace S. Elden, Ohio State University.

1. *Quid* as *apodosis*.—In rhetorical questions involving a condition the *apodosis* is sometimes represented by *quid* alone without a verb expressed. The ellipsis may be supplied in a general way by a word of saying, happening, or the like, as *dicas*, *fiat*, etc.

Quid begins the period and either the indicative or the subjunctive may stand in the protasis. Sometimes the question is followed by another by which it is more clearly defined, the second question implying what the result would be if the content of the first were realized. Horace, *Od.* III, 9, 17—20; I, 24, 13—18; *Serm.* II, 3, 159—160; II, 3, 219—220; II, 7, 42—43; *Epist.* I, 16, 8—11; I, 19, 12—14.

2. *Quodsi*.—The origin of *quod* in *quodsi* is doubtful; probably it may be regarded as the accusative singular neuter of the relative pronoun used as an accusative of extent or specification, "as for that," "as to which."

Quodsi occurs in Plautus (*cf.* Trin, 217) and Terence (*Andr.*, 258; *Phorm.*, 201; *Eun.*, 924). It is found also in Lucretius, at least twenty times (often in connection with *forte*) Virgil, Catullus (3), Tibullus (2), three times in the *Carmina Pseudotibulliana*, twenty-six

times in Ovid, twenty times in Propertius, also in Juvenal, Persius, Martial and Phaedrus.

In Horace there are seventeen instances of *quodsi* (not including Od., I, 24, 13, where *quid si* is the better reading, nor Serm., I, 1, 43, where *quod* probably has the force of *at id*), twice in the Odes (I, 1, 35; III, 1, 41), four times in the Epodes (2, 39; 10, 21; 11, 15; 14, 13), once in the Sermones (II, 4, 6), ten times in the Epistles (I, 1, 70; I, 2, 70; I, 3, 25; I, 7, 10; I, 7, 25; I, 9, 11; I, 19, 17; I, 20, 9; II, 1, 90; II, 1, 241).

In prose *quodsi* occurs first in Cicero, who uses it very frequently, then in Nepos, Cæsar, and Sallust. In Livy it is rare, as also in the later writers.

3. *The imperative in a challenge.*—The imperative is sometimes used in an ironical exhortation or admonition to do something which, after what has been said, or under existing conditions, is out of all reason, or even inconceivable; a protasis, as *si potes*, is implied. Serm., II, 2, 14-15; Epist. I, 6, 17-18; II, 2, 76.

11. "The Epigraphic Sources of Dion Cassius," by Dr. Duane Reed Stuart, State Normal College, Ypsilanti.

Assuming that the prevalent attitude of the historians of the Empire toward the testimony of monumental sources is marked by indifference, it is, nevertheless, desirable to form a precise estimate of the individual author in terms of his use or neglect of inscriptions. The *Historia Romana* of Dion Cassius, as an important source for the history of the Empire, challenges especial attention. Furthermore, such an inquiry will contribute data applicable in the determination of those disputed quantities—Dion's historical sincerity and the credibility of his work.

A comparison of the *Monumentum Ancyranum* with the parallel passages of the *Historia Romana* was taken as a point of departure. In two of the three instances in which surface examination reveals likeness, the existing resemblance is due to the influence on both narratives of a natural or traditionally-crystallized mode of expression [cf. M. A., 2, 29-33; Dion, LIV, x, 3; M. A., 5, 3-6; Dion, L, vi, 4]. In the remaining case Dion's dependence on literary sources is clear [M. A., 3, 19-21; Dion, LV, x, 1]. Entirely overshadowing these instances of agreement are the cases (eight in all) in which Dion has neglected the testimony of the inscription and fallen into error thereby. The *Historia Romana*, therefore, shows no traces of deliberate recourse to, or indirect reminiscence of, the *Monumentum Ancyranum*.

The conclusions that may be drawn from Dion's neglect of the *Monumentum Ancyranum* are affected by two cardinal considerations: (1) Is the *Monumentum Ancyranum* a true copy of the *Res Gestae* of Augustus, mentioned by Suetonius [Aug., 101] and Dion [LVI, xxxiii, 1]? (2) Was the original *in situ* in Dion's time? An affirmative reply was given to each of these questions. In connection with the former an attempt was made to refute in detail the arguments advanced by J. W. Beck [Mnemosyne, 25, p. 349; 26, p. 237] against the Augustan authorship of the *Monumentum Ancyranum* and its identification with the *Res Gestae*.

The *Fasti* and *Acta* of the Regia, useful as their content would have been, Dion treated with the same neglect as his predecessors. We may add to the conspicuous divergences discernible in connection with the dictator-years of Julius Cæsar, four reversals in the order of naming the consuls, and one actual difference in tradition.

Further evidence of the historian's indifference to inscriptional sources is furnished by various passages of the *Historia Romana*. In LIV, xi, 7, LVII, xvii, 7-8, and LXXVI, xii, 3 Dion might have avoided error and exaggeration had he taken the pains to check his narrative by personal inspection of monuments accessible to him.

Turning to the affirmative evidence obtainable, we find but three cases, in which it is feasible to predicate first-hand appeal to an inscription [LXVIII, ii, 4; LXIX, xix, 2; LXXII, xxii, 3]. These are surface references, the first two, epitaphs of striking content, the third, Commodus's inscription on the base of the Colossus. Dion quotes from memory these bits of antiquarian information, because they happen to occur to him at the moment of writing. His attitude is *not* that of the diligent inquirer who has gone to the stones for data by which to amplify or verify the material furnished by his literary sources. In Dion's account of the column of Trajan [LXVIII, xvi, 2], there appears to be an echo, possibly unconscious, of C. I. L., VI, 960.

This paper which, on account of the length of the programme, was read by title, will be published in full later.

12. "The Worship of the Lares," by Dr. Gordon J. Laing, University of Chicago.

This paper will be published in full.

13. "The Psychological Background of Indirect Discourse," by Professor John J. Schlicher, State Normal School, Terre Haute, Ind.

This paper is printed in full; see p. 399.

14. "A Review of Gildersleeve's Greek Syntax," by Professor S. J. Axtell, Kalamazoo College.

Professor Axtell had commenced the preparation of this paper when he was stricken with a serious illness. It was at first thought that he would recover; but the third week in March there was a change for the worse, and he was released from suffering on Sunday, March 23.

When the title of Professor Axtell's paper was reached on the program, Professor Martin L. D'Ooge, of the University of Michigan, paid an earnest tribute to his exalted worth as a man, his minute and accurate scholarship, and his influence as a teacher. In emphasizing the loss which the interests of our higher education have experienced, Professor D'Ooge voiced the feeling of all present who were familiar with Professor Axtell's work.

15. "The Similes of Apollonius Rhodius Compared with those of Virgil and Homer," by Mr. M. C. Wier, Michigan Military Academy.

For teachers of Greek and Latin in secondary schools, particularly teachers of Homer and Virgil, a most interesting work for supplementary reading is the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius. Though this poet borrowed about 80 per cent. of his vocabulary from Homer, and appropriated Homeric tags and half-lines almost to the number of his verses, he has nevertheless given us a work unique in ancient literature, possessing a charm that even Virgil tried to borrow, with only imperfect success.

One of the characteristics of Apollonius's style is his prodigal use of similes. In a poem of six thousand verses he uses about a hundred and fifty comparisons. This is surprising when we see that in the same number of verses in the *Iliad* (I-X) there are less than sixty, and in the *Aeneid* (I-VIII) there are less than twenty.

Homer and Virgil seem to use the simile when great actions are being described; to present a picture that will render the action more vivid rather than for literary embellishment. Apollonius uses it primarily as an ornament. There is comparatively little action in his poem. At best it is merely a series of episodes loosely strung together. Throughout these he has used the figure almost as lavishly as Shelley in his lyrics. As a literary embellishment it is often beautiful, and occasionally stands out so cameo-like as to divert our attention from its setting. Many of the similes, however, are so forced and unnatural that even the scholiast criticises their inaptness.

Apollonius has imitated Homer nineteen times, but has never appropriated his similes unaltered. He generally expands Homer's idea and uses it in a different connection, just as he does Homeric adjectives.

Both Apollonius and Virgil have in a number of instances imitated the same Homeric simile; one may compare, for example, *Odyssey* 6, 102 ff. with *Arg.* 3, 875 ff., and *Æn.* 1, 498 ff.; *Il.* 2, 87 ff. with *Arg.* 1, 879, and *Æn.* 6, 707, 1, 430; *Il.* 2, 459 with *Arg.* 4, 1296, and *Æn.* 7, 699; *Il.* 6, 506 with *Arg.* 3, 1258 and *Æn.* 11, 492.

One of Apollonius's most successful ways of affecting Homer is in the aggregation of similes. In the passage where Jason slays the giants that spring from the dragon's teeth there are nine within fifty verses (*Arg.* 3, 1350-1400); with this compare *Il.* 2, 455-483.

"Subjective imagery from sensation and thought," says Professor Jebb, "is extremely rare in Homer. Once there is a simile from a dream, in which the dreamer cannot overtake one who flies from him (*Il.* 22, 199). Hērā is likened for swiftness to the thoughts of a man who has traveled in many lands; he considers in his wise heart, Would that I were there or there, and thinks wistfully of many things (*Il.* 15, 82)."

The subjective imagery of the *Argonautica* forms one of its most interesting characteristics. The inmost workings of the mind are brought into direct comparison with physical phenomena. After contrasting the silence of the night and the slumber that had fallen on men and animals with the tumult in the mind of Medea, Apollonius compares the passionate movements of her heart to the flickering gleam of sunlight cast on a wall from a vessel full of water (*Arg.* 3, 743);

And her heart was wildly stirred within her breast; as when a sunbeam, reflected from water, plays upon the walls of a house—water just poured into a basin or pail: hither and thither it darts on the quick eddy; even so the maiden's heart was fluttering in her breast.

Virgil has translated the same simile thus (*Æn.* 8, 22):

Sicut aquae tremulum labris ubi lumen aënis
Sole repperçussum, aut radiantis imagine lunae,
Omnia pervolitat late loca, iamque sub auras
Erigitur summique ferit laquearia tecti.

Athena hastening seaward toward the Argo (2, 543) is compared to a man "who goes wandering from his country as oft we men do in our hardihood, and there is no land too far away, for every path lies open before his eyes, when lo! he seeth in his mind his own home and there

appeareth to it a way over land or sea, and keenly he pondereth this way and that, and searcheth it out with his eyes" (see also *Arg.* 2, 291; 3, 446; 3, 1019).

Many of Apollonius's similes are drawn from nature. The light of the heavenly bodies, the glow reflected from a passing cloud, the beam reflected from water are used often with a very pretty effect. He is also fond of introducing specters and phantoms, and makes frequent use of the pathetic.

The range of Apollonius's similes is about the same as that of Homer's. He keeps, however, within a more poetic latitude. He would not, for example, compare his hero to an ass, although Homer introduces that animal in describing the stubbornness of Ajax. He has used several similes that do not occur before his time; Virgil seems particularly fond of these (*cf.* *Arg.* 4, 125 with *Æn.* 8, 622; *Arg.* 1, 307 with *Æn.* 4, 143; *Arg.* 2, 934 with *Æn.* 5, 213; *Arg.* 4, 1475 with *Æn.* 6, 451).

16. "The Recent Changes in the Curriculum of the German Gymnasium," by Dr. Henry A. Sanders, University of Michigan.

This paper will appear in the SCHOOL REVIEW for June.

17. "Certain Controlling Conceptions in Syntactical Study, and their Application," by Professor Wm. Gardner Hale, University of Chicago.

This paper will be published in full in the June issue.

18. "An Experiment in the Teaching of Roman History to Young Pupils," by Mr. J. Raleigh Nelson, Lewis Institute, Chicago.

The relation between the study of Latin and the study of Roman history is reciprocal, the latter furnishing the environment in which the former may be imagined to live, the language work producing the demand for the historical setting. The divorce of the two is unnatural and each suffers a distinct disadvantage from the separation. When, some time since, we determined at the Lewis Institute, to attempt a reconciliation, we found the problem of correlation a difficult one. The traditional courses had been stripped for light running, and we hesitated to add any weight that might lower their time record.

The first year was finally chosen for the beginning of our experiment, (1) because there was here the greatest need of some new human interest; (2) because we hoped to make our Latin work compete more

successfully in attractiveness with the technical courses ; (3) because the young student is most receptive to the romance of history ; (4) because the success of our experiment would benefit the other Latin courses.

The difficulty lay in the adaptation of the work to the peculiar mind to which we proposed to introduce it. To plunge the young student unprepared into remote antiquity in a country of which he knew little and cared less, would have removed all probability of his ever properly adjusting himself. A boy or girl with no knowledge of men and no familiarity with life could not reasonably be expected to reconstruct a great new world, unless he be given materials intelligible to him. Moreover, such a policy would neither regard nor utilize the resistless stream of his peculiar interest and activities. My aim in this preliminary work, therefore, was to find the most natural and stimulating method of appeal.

There are few suggestions to which the adolescent mind responds with more spontaneity than the proposition of a pleasure trip. The promise of a story by the way makes the charm irresistible. The goal is a matter of indifference ; it is the romance of going, the joy of a new activity. The imagination is one of the most striking characteristics of this period, a motive which, touched and rightly directed, becomes an important factor in any educational problem.

When in September I proposed a trip to Italy, I found the pupils very responsive. I put at their disposal prospectuses, time tables, pictures and the like, procured from the steamship companies ; we discussed boats, their size, construction, speed records, etc. And when the day arrived, after a thorough discussion, we started from Chicago, and in our imagination traveled all the way. Vivid bits of description from here and there and the use of all the illustrative material at my command helped to give the touch of reality to the occasion. When we steamed into the bay of Naples, Italy was bound to the here and now of each boy's life by a definite chain of association which gave it new meaning.

The following week the trip was written up in our notebooks, to which we gave the pretentious name, "Guide Books to Rome and Modern Italy." The individuality shown in the arrangement of these records was one of the most interesting elements in the experiment. Every one had something to show for each of his trips, from the creepy, crawly, cramp-handed account of the boy with one small talent to beautiful books illustrated with Perry pictures, cuttings from old

magazines and velox prints from the large collection of negatives at my command.

After another week's preparation, aided by the stereopticon, I took my company to the few points in Naples, around the bay to Pozzuoli, Baia, Miseno, Cumae, back by Lake Avernus and the Lucrine Lake, to Naples. I aimed to develop a definite conception of the location of these places, not only by constant reference to the map, but by emphasizing the time and money spent in reaching them. I left with each place the association of every available story, and tried in every way to produce an impression of color and atmosphere.

In the ten trips which followed, the same plan was pursued, a week of anticipation, an hour of touring, with the stereopticon, a week of reminiscence in the form of guide-book notes. The itinerary of the class for the twenty-four weeks will indicate the scope of the work.

1. An ocean voyage from New York to Naples.
 2. A general view of Naples.
Pozzuoli, Lago Lucrino, Baia, Capo di Miseno, Cumae, Lago Averno.
 3. Herculaneum, Pompeii, Vesuvius.
 4. Salerno, Paestum, Amalfi, Capri, Sorrento.
 5. Naples to Rome; a general view of the city from Porto del Popolo to the Capitol.
 6. The Forum and Sacred Way.
 7. Places of amusement—Piazza Navona, Theater of Marcellus, Circus Maximus, Colosseum, Baths of Caracalla.
 8. The Tiber and its bridges, with a trip to Ostia.
 9. The Appian Way.
 10. The Sabine Mountains.
Hadrian's Villa, Tivoli, Vico Varo, Licienza, Subiaco.
 11. The Volscian Hills.
Velletri, Cori, Norba, Ninfa, Segni.
 12. The Alban Mountains.
Albano, Ariccia, Nemi, Palazzuolo, Rocca di Papa, Monte Cavo.
- This brought the pupils at the end of the course to the very birthplace of Roman tradition.

In this preliminary work my aim was to lead the pupil naturally from the near to the far, from the present to the past; to give him a feeling of intimate acquaintance with the geography of Italy, to create a conception of the physical environment in which the Roman lived; in short to induce a state of mind in which a definite, systematic knowledge of Roman history would be a crying need, demanded by every interest of his heart.

An effort to associate with each trip a special vocabulary of Latin words helped to give them new meaning, thus :

For the ocean trips, *navis, mare, nubes, caelum, stella, luna, sinus, latus*, etc.

For the land trips, *mons, collis, lacus, flumen, arbor*, etc.

For the town trips, *urbs, via, domus, templum, forum, taberna*, etc.

The pupil may be encouraged to write in his notebook each time five or six simple Latin sentences regarding his trip, using the vocabulary suggested for that time. And when in the regular Latin lessons I could give new meaning to a word by recalling some place we had visited, I took pains to do so.

Thus the trip every two weeks served as a constant stimulus to the work, furnishing a goal of interest toward which we worked, and not only did it inspire life and vigor in the class, but actually performed an important mission in visualizing the Latin vocabulary.

The six months of preliminary study which I have outlined was followed by six months of systematic history work, one lesson a week, the book used being Morey's *Outlines of Roman History*. At the end of the first year we had studied to the close of the second Punic war, and by Christmas of the following year, to the assassination of Cæsar.

In connection with the history I arranged a very simple course in Roman life, taking up those topics most naturally interesting to the pupils, the house, the slaves, the books, children's games, public amusements, etc. For the boys I found, as was natural in a technical school, that all problems of construction were especially attractive, building materials, the handling of great weights, construction of roads, etc.

In the third year, I assigned each pupil one topic in Roman antiquities, for which he must read extensively, and which he must present to the class some time during the year. These papers, which often represented months of preparation, were always followed by discussion, and a study of the illustrative material applicable to the subject for the day. All the pupils were required to keep notebooks and were held responsible for the important points presented.

The results of our experiments so far have been so encouraging that it is my hope as soon as possible to make this sort of work continuous for the four years.

19. "The Relation between Greek and Roman History," by Dr. Arthur L. Cross, University of Michigan.

Although, with the increase of specially trained teachers and improved manuals, great progress has been made during the past few

years in the teaching of ancient history, much still remains to be done. Text-books and teachers who use them are too prone to miss the essential relationships in national and international development. Bewildering series of military and political annals, dry and dusty antiquities sprinkled here and there with entertaining but apocryphal legends, moments of grand and unique achievement in literature and art, are presented as isolated phenomena. The young mind, attracted by the pomp and circumstance of war, has much to gratify its taste; and, under favorable conditions, one of different inclinations may acquire an appreciation of the beauty and grace of ancient culture. But rarely does the pupil have laid before him a coherent picture of the development of Greek and Roman public life. Almost never does he attain a realization of the fact that what he is studying has any organic connection with the present. With more perspective, with a keener sense of the unity of all history, teachers might make more of their subject, might make it more interesting, not interesting in the sense of entertaining, but rather as Sir John Seeley defined the term, as touching our broadest and most vital interests.

This result might be brought about by teaching the history of Greece and Rome as a single subject. Not only does the history of the two countries belong together, but the causes and consequences of their contact present problems far more fruitful to the student of today than those to which his attention is usually directed.

Almost from the earliest times one can trace relationships between the two civilizations; but from the beginning of the second century before the Christian era, when Rome enters upon its eastern conquests their destiny becomes almost inextricably interwoven. For the conquest was by no means one-sided. As Rome conquers Greece so Greece conquers Rome. Rome subjects and Romanizes the Hellenic east as to government, but Hellas indelibly stamps its culture and civilization upon its victor. As a result of the contact Roman institutions, military and political, social and economic, religious and intellectual, are utterly transformed. Moreover, the consequences of the change have deeply colored our whole modern life. Greek history did not end with the victories of Philip of Macedon; but, through the work of his still greater son, passed into a wider, an Hellenic stage, when the best and the worst fruits of Greek civilization were spread through western Asia and northern Africa. Had Alexander lived to carry out his plans he might have conquered and Hellenized the western as he had the eastern world. But what he might have done was

accomplished in a different way—through the Roman intervention in eastern affairs.

As a consequence of the Great Wars not only did the simple city state on the Tiber become a great world empire, but Greek manners and customs, Greek art and architecture, Greek philosophy and literature took absolute possession of the Roman. Accordingly, what Rome, as the custodian of ancient civilization, passed on to the modern world, was, in its non-political aspects, at least, an essentially Hellenic civilization.

This brief abstract aims only to suggest a method of regarding ancient history which may prove helpful to teacher and pupil alike. It is not the study of Greece by itself, it is not the study of Rome by itself; it is not military and political annals alone, it is not the study of great literary epochs in the past taken by themselves: it is a vast synthesis of all these as they acted and re-acted upon one another that tell the whole story and makes us realize how the nations of antiquity were related to each other, and how they are related to us.

It should be added, in conclusion, that the method here advocated would offer no excuse for neglecting the facts. To teach generalization to pupils who are not thoroughly grounded in the details on which they are based is to build a house on sand. That kind of teaching leads to superficiality, intellectual flabbiness, and even to dishonesty. What should be insisted upon is that the teacher should not only drill the pupil in the acquisition of facts, but guide him in their interpretation. That one who does both, and only that one, is a true teacher of history.

20. "Travel in Greece as a Preparation for Teaching Greek History," by Miss May E. Barnes, Bay City High School.

This paper was illustrated by forty stereopticon slides made from recent photographs.

Miss Barnes gave an account of a tour in Greece made in company with a number of students of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, in the spring of 1901. The company left Rome March 15, stopping at Benevento on the way to Brindisi, in order to see the Arch of Trajan. From Brindisi they went by steamer to Patras, spending several delightful hours on the island of Corfu.

Starting from Patras, March 19, they made the tour of the Peloponnesus, first visiting Olympia, then crossing the mountains to Megalopolis on horseback. From Kalamata they went over the

Langada Pass to Sparta, from Sparta by carriage to Tripolitza, afterwards visiting Argos, the Argive Heraeum, Mycenae, Tiryns, and Epidaurus while making their headquarters for some days at Nauplia.

After a sojourn of two weeks at Athens, whence excursions were made to Eleusis, the plain of Marathon, and Mt. Pentelicus, the party started for the tour of northern Greece. The greater number took the overland route to Delphi, visiting Thebes and other interesting sites along the way; the rest went around by water to the ancient seaport of Delphi. From Delphi some returned to Athens, to work in the museums; the rest went on horseback over the shoulder of Mt. Parnassus to Thermopylae and Lamia, thence by carriage to the wretched village that represents the ancient Pharsalus; connections were there made by rail for Larissa, whence the Vale of Tempe was visited. The return to Athens was made by boat from Volo.

On the way from Athens back to Patras, a day was spent inspecting the American excavations on the site of ancient Corinth. The party landed at Brindisi early in the morning of May 10.

The slides presented a representative selection of views and monuments, which the party saw, and which, for those who have seen them, remain an invaluable aid in the interpretation of the events and the civilization with which they are associated.

21. "In the Footsteps of Cæsar in Gaul," by Principal George R. Swain, Bay City High School.

The sixty stereopticon slides used in illustrating this paper are from original negatives made by Mr. Swain during the summer of 1899. "An ideal vacation for teachers of Cæsar," said the speaker, "is a wheel trip over the routes of Cæsar's Gallic campaigns." "If one wishes to take photographs of any value," he added, "a camera of the long-focus type is indispensable."

CÆSAR, DE BELLO GALLICO, BOOK I, I-XX.

Cæsar's eighteen miles of fortifications had no need to be continuous. For fully three-quarters of the way from Geneva to the Pas de l'Écluse sharply sloping or precipitous banks render fording utterly impossible. One steep bank is as good as two to prevent crossing. On the alluvial flats, where there were fords, the river channel may not be in just the same place now as then, but the width of the flat has probably not materially changed.

When the Helvetians decided to pass along the north bank of the Rhone, owing to the short range of their missiles the Romans could

only helplessly watch the great company of emigrants file along the narrow road notched in the side of the cañon. Two men stationed on the south bank with as many Gatling or Maxim guns and an unlimited supply of ammunition could have stopped — or killed — the entire Helvetian nation.

The country between the Pas de l'Écluse and the Saône is so rugged, so cut with steep-walled valleys and high ridges, that the consent of the inhabitant to their passage had to be secured by the Helvetians, else a small force might have ambuscaded or turned back the emigrants.

The Saône may be described as aptly today as two thousand years ago by Cæsar's words, for it even now flows *incredibili lenitate ita ut oculis in utram partem fluat iudicari non possit*. For miles above Lyons there is not a current ripple on the stream.

The exact *mons* where Cæsar planned to attack the enemy whose march he had been dogging for days (chaps. xxi and xxii) cannot today be easily identified. The erosion of the storms of twenty centuries, together with age-long cultivation, especially in a region of rather soft country rock, tends to level hills and fill valleys.

Mont Beuvray, the site of Bibracte, dominates the view for miles. Its slopes today are nearly all wooded clear to the plateau-like summit. The surrounding country is one of the loveliest sections of France. Many fragments of pottery from the site of Bibracte may be seen in the museum at St. Germain-en-Laye, near Paris.

The site of the final battle with the Helvetians (according to Colonel Stoffel) is near the modern village of Montmort. From the hill where Cæsar drew up his troops almost every foot of the field can be seen. The rise of the slope of the hill is still enough to wind a man even of good lungs should he rush up the ascent with the same speed as did the eager Helvetians. The place where the final bitter struggle among the carts of the baggage train was waged, is quite deeply cut by ravines. The entire site is practically under cultivation, save toward the tops of some of the higher hills.

BOOK VII, LXIX-XC.

The plateau of Alesia is a position of great natural military strength — to armies unacquainted with gunpowder. Rapid fire one-pounders could rake the hill from at least four surrounding heights. The slopes today in numerous places are very steep, occasionally precipitous. The plateau itself is cultivated, but the soil is shallow and stony. The peasants till the slopes well up toward the summit.

The modern village of Alise-Ste.-Reine is perched on the shoulder of the eminence. Just above is the bronze statue¹ of Vercingetorix, the first national hero of France. With steadfast look he gazes off over the plain where the fiercest fighting strewn the earth with corpses. As one goes to the south, for miles the image of the great Gallic chieftain is visible on the sky line. Had Vercingetorix possessed a fighting machine of blood, bone, and iron equal to the Roman legionary, would his genius or that of Cæsar have triumphed?

Every student of Cæsar who happens to be in Paris should by all means visit the museum at St. Germain (already referred to), for here are displayed scores of rusty Roman and Gallic weapons found on the site of Alesia in the course of the excavations authorized by Napoleon III.

22. "Ten Years of Excavation at Pompeii: 1892-1901," by Professor Francis W. Kelsey, University of Michigan.

The speaker, by way of introduction, spoke briefly of the eruption of Vesuvius, which, in August of the year 79, overwhelmed the cities of Pompeii, Herculaneum, and Stabiae; the progress of the excavations at Pompeii, commenced in March, 1748, was then traced in outline, and four decades of discovery were mentioned as of especial importance: 1763-72, 1813-22, 1823-32, and the decade just brought to a close, 1892-1901.

The most important results of excavation in the last decade are: the unearthing of the House of the Silver Wedding, in 1892-93, which has the largest and most imposing atrium yet found in Pompeii; the excavation of the House of the Vettii, in 1894-95, containing small paintings that give us new data for a true appreciation of the attainments of the ancients in this field of art; the uncovering, in 1894-96, of the villa near Boscoreale, a short distance north of Pompeii, the plan of which illustrates, better than that of any other villa yet brought to light, the arrangement of a Roman farmhouse, and in which was found the remarkable treasure of silver plate presented by Baron Rothschild to the Louvre; the removal of the débris, in 1898-99, from the site of the temple of Venus Pompeiana, patron goddess of the city, which, if completed, would have been the largest and finest of Pompeian temples; and, finally, the discovery, in November, 1900,

¹ A second statue of Vercingetorix is about to be erected at Clermont-Ferrand, a few miles from the site of Gergovia.

of the bronze statue of a youth in the remains of a shop just north of the Vesuvius gate, outside the city.

The plan of the Villa of Boscoreale was explained, and slides of several specimens of the silverware found in it were shown and interpreted. The lecture was illustrated by thirty-five stereopticon slides.

JOSEPH H. DRAKE.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

QUINTILIAN ON EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT TEACHINGS.¹

THE essential identity of modern with ancient culture in certain fundamental aspects has been brought home to me by a comparison of the work of Dr. James M. Buckley, entitled *Extemporaneous Oratory for Professional and Amateur Speakers*, with some parts of the work of Quintilian. Dr. Buckley's book was written after his long experience as an acceptable lecturer on this subject before theological seminaries and law schools, at the direct and coincident request of two faculties; it may fairly be accepted as an expression of modern views, just as we may take Quintilian's work as the expression of the ancient.

Verbal identity of phrase is here out of the question, since the speakers use different languages; but practical identity of thought will be readily apparent if corresponding statements be set side by side. This practical identity will appear if Quintilian be quoted only in translation; in order to make clearer the modern tone of the ancient writer, the references to the passages cited will be withheld until both the ancient and the modern statements shall have been quoted; there will thus be a chance for the reader who wishes to do so, to apply the test of that instantaneous discrimination between new and old which comes from our more intimate knowledge of modern teachings.

First, then, as to the regard in which extemporaneous oratory is held as an art. We may compare these statements: (1, in which the writer is speaking to students of rhetoric) "The richest fruit of all our study and the most ample recompense for the extent of our labor is the faculty of speaking extempore." (2) "I would again praise before any other acquisition that of expressing forcibly and with ease any idea which the mind may contain." (3) "Oratory is the greatest of arts." The question is whether we feel able to declare which is the ancient and which the modern expression, until we have learned that quotation

¹ Paper read at the Classical Conference at Ann Arbor, Michigan, March 27.

No. 1 is from Quintilian (*Inst. Orat.*, X, vii : 1); No. 2, the words of Sargent Prentiss to his brother, quoted by Buckley, p. 390; No. 3, Buckley's own expression, p. 1.

Second, as to the basis of the peculiar quality of this art, we may compare the following: (1) "Every extemporaneous address is the product of the whole man—mind, heart, voice—every supporting and expressing organ contributing in varying degrees of energy." (2) "For it is strength of feeling combined with energy of intellect, that renders us eloquent." In this case quotation No. 1 is from Buckley, p. 33; and No. 2, from Quintilian (X, vii : 15).

Third, with regard to the means of acquiring this desirable art. The topic is most readily treated in subdivisions.

(a) Years of learning are needed to fill the fountain of ideas and words. Compare: (1) "A double basis, compounded as follows: First, of a wide and thorough general education Second, of the habit of constant and searching reflection." (2) "We must acquire an ample store of the best language." (3) "We must study at all times and in all places." No. 1, the words of Gladstone, quoted by Buckley, p. 337; No. 2, Quintilian (X, vii : 7); No. 3, Quintilian, (X, vii : 27).

(b) Trained habit will build paths of thought. Compare: (1) "Grooves are usually formed in the beginning of a career," and (2) "He who shall speak according to a certain method will be led forward as by a sure guide." No. 1, from Buckley, p. 307; No. 2, from Quintilian. (X, vii : 6).

(c) The art of the extemporizer is the art of conversation. Compare: (1) "Nor must we omit to notice the advice that no portion even of our common conversation should ever be careless, and that whatever we may say and wherever we may say it, it should be as far as possible excellent in its kind;" and (2) "Except in the case of some (speakers) in constant practice who abstain from talking in private because they have so much of it to do in public, I doubt if an instance can be found of a successful extemporizer who is not what would be called "a great talker." No. 1 is from Quintilian (X, vii : 28); No. 2, from Buckley, p. 187.

(*d*) The habit of written composition is useful in forming language for the extemporizer. Compare: (1) "The quest for new words should be ceaseless. To imprint these indelibly the habit of writing should be maintained . . . should the neglect of composition and self-criticism be prolonged (speakers who have quit writing) will become padders;" and (2) "We must certainly write never more than when we have to speak most extempore . . . as it appears that by writing we speak with greatest accuracy." No. 1 is from Buckley, p. 325; No. 2, Quintilian (X, vii : 28).

(*e*) Habit and exercise are the mainstay of extempore facility. Compare: (1) "For it is habit and exercise that chiefly beget facility, and, if they be intermitted even for a short period, not only will our fluency be diminished, but our mouth may even be closed;" and (2, in which a great orator, speaking of the need of practice to maintain perfection, says:) "During five whole sessions I spoke every night but one, and I regret that I did not speak that night too:" No. 1, the expression of Quintilian (X, vii : 8); No. 2, the words of the English orator Fox, quoted by Buckley, p. 360.

It would be easy to multiply the parallels, and perhaps it would be superfluous; but one more example may be given: An incidental characterization of extemporary eloquence is as follows: "The overflow of a full mind, swelling in the joyous excitement of a friendly reception, kindling in the glowing theme, suggested by the occasion, and not unmoved by the spirit of the place." Is this quotation to be assigned to Buckley, to Quintilian, or to Edward Everett?

The modern tone of Quintilian's teaching is, after all, easy to account for; oratory involves relations of human nature, which does not change. The methods of appeal are the same today as two thousand years ago; the insight of Quintilian as a teacher of oratory has not been surpassed, and so his teachings remain, tested and true.

GEORGE V. EDWARDS

OLIVET COLLEGE.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF INDIRECT DISCOURSE.¹

I.

PSYCHOLOGICALLY speaking, there is no such thing as giving directly the words or thoughts of another person; for before we can express these thoughts, they must pass into our own minds, and our expression is then, strictly speaking, merely the expression of a section of our own consciousness. Still, the distinction which we make between direct and indirect discourse can be justified in psychology as well as in grammar. The difference between the two is that in direct discourse we make a positive effort to eliminate the work of our minds, and to report merely the record of our senses, while in indirect discourse we do not make this effort, but simply give expression to the thoughts of the other person exactly as they lie in our own consciousness at the time. This being the case, a psychological discussion of indirect discourse will have to do with the state or states of the mind which result from its contact with foreign ideas; in other words, the discussion must be based on a study of the mental processes which are involved in hearing, or reading, the thoughts of another person.

To avoid unnecessary complications in a matter which is, at the best, complicated enough, we will leave out of account, for the time being, such forms of speech as questions and commands, and will confine ourselves, at the outset, to the consideration of declarative statements addressed by one person to another, say by A to B.

To begin with, then, it is perfectly clear that the ideas expressed by A are not all received with the same readiness in the mind of B. Some ideas are inherently more difficult to grasp than others. But entirely apart from its inherent character, the difficulty or ease with which B takes up an idea

¹ Paper read at the Classical Conference at Ann Arbor, Mich., March 27.

expressed by A, will depend even more decidedly upon whether the idea has at some previous time been present in B's mind or not. If the idea has been so present and B is already familiar with it at the time when A expresses it, then A's statement will, of course, serve merely to call it up again in B's consciousness. This is a very simple and rapid psychological process. It requires no appreciable time or effort of B. And as B will at once recognize the idea as his own, he will, of course, under all ordinary conditions, not ascribe it to A at all, even though A has expressed it. Therefore, in case B ever expresses this idea, he will naturally express it as his own. Hence in such a case indirect discourse is not possible.

Very different is the case, on the other hand, when A says something which B will not recognize as his own, but as A's, that is, when A tells B something which B does not know as yet, and with which his mind has had no previous experience. It is only under such conditions that B can ever look upon an idea in his own mind as still belonging to A, and it is only in this case, therefore, that indirect discourse will naturally result. This is the case, then, that we must now proceed to consider in some detail.

We find in the first place, that at the time when A makes his statement, the idea which he expresses is a fully assimilated and integral part of his mental stock, a finished product, if we may use the term, which is ready for delivery. The process of transfer from A to B will consist of two parts: The first is the utterance of A, the second is the mental activity of B, by which the idea is either accommodated to the content of his mind, or else is found incompatible with it and is rejected. If the idea is accepted by B, it becomes in due time a part of *his* mental stock, and is then, in the end, with him just what it originally was with A, a finished product ready for delivery. Therefore, if upon reaching this point, B should express himself so far as that particular idea is concerned, he would do it just as A did it before him, that is, his attitude toward the idea would be that of the full possessor.

Now, it is neither the original utterance by A, nor this final

utterance by B, with which we are at present concerned. For in both of these utterances the speakers are merely expressing ideas which they must feel to be their own. Indirect discourse, on the other hand, has to do only with the expression of ideas belonging to other persons. Genuine, spontaneous, indirect discourse will, therefore, be employed only during that time which follows the original utterance of A, and precedes the complete assimilation of the idea in the mind of B, that is, during the time when the idea has as yet been but partially or conditionally appropriated by B, or it may be, has failed of acceptance altogether. For it is only in this preliminary state of incomplete assimilation that the idea, while already present in B's mind, still appears to him to belong to A.

Let us, then, examine more closely this preliminary condition, in which the idea is temporarily delayed or permanently arrested in its progress toward full assimilation in the mind of B. We find that this preliminary process really embraces two stages, which can easily be distinguished, an earlier and a later. The change from the one to the other is occasioned by a shifting of the attention on the part of B. In the very beginning, while A is speaking, B's attention is, of course, fixed mainly upon him and his actions, and it is not until A has done, that this attention turns with any completeness to the idea itself. In the first stage, therefore, that is, in the time during and directly following the utterance of A, the idea is marked in B's mind by an overwhelming sense of the original speaker's authorship and ownership. It is not, indeed, so much an idea, as it is an activity of A, that fills B's mind at this time.

But as B's attention is more and more withdrawn from the speaker and confined to the idea itself, this strong feeling of A's ownership and authorship of the idea will, of course, likewise gradually fade away in B's mind, until finally the sense of A's connection with the idea becomes quite vague and dim. This is the second stage in the preliminary process of assimilation, in which the idea lies in B's mind as a more or less abstract proposition, as so much pure thought-matter, more or less neutral so far as relations of ownership to individual persons are

concerned. After this point is reached, if conditions are favorable, the idea will move on into the third and last stage of assimilation, and will pass completely into the possession of B, or in other words, the sense of B's own possession of it will take the place of his former sense of A's possession.

We may, then, roughly designate the three stages in the process of complete transfer and assimilation of an idea, as they are reflected in the successive states of B's mind, as follows: (1) idea + A; (2) idea, more or less pure; (3) idea + B. In those cases where ideas expressed by A are but partially or conditionally assimilated by B, or are rejected entirely, of course only the first two of these stages are ever reached: (1) idea + A; (2) idea, more or less free from personal associations.

II.

Fortunately, we have preserved to us, in Latin, cases of direct spontaneous expression of each of these three stages in the assimilation of ideas. For convenience we will take them up in the reverse order, and will discuss first the stage that is reached last. In this stage, the one in which the idea has been fully absorbed by B, and is completely in his possession, his method of expressing it will, of course, be the declarative statement, just as it was in the original expression by A. This is not indirect discourse, and with this stage in the process we are, therefore, not concerned, except, perhaps, in so far as the parenthetical remarks which proceed from the reporter's own knowledge, and which have the indicative in Latin, may be said to have a legitimate place in a discussion of indirect discourse.

The second stage in the process has been described as the one in which the sense of A's authorship of the idea, and the prominence of A's personality in it has, so far as B's consciousness is concerned, faded away to a certain extent, in which the idea is left in B's mind as pure thought-matter which is not very closely associated with an owner. The direct expression of an idea in this stage may be expected, therefore, after B's mind has been busy with the idea for a time, without being able completely to assimilate it.

Now if we stop to think about these efforts which B has, by this time, made to assimilate the idea, we must realize that they cannot have occurred without affecting the form of the idea itself. One change, at least, the idea must have suffered, a change that every idea undergoes when it is subjected to mental labor. We mean the change by which the idea is inevitably reduced to that which to the hearer's mind is its simplest and most portable shape, through the elimination of all that is irrelevant or of no present consequence to the hearer. The spontaneous expression of a foreign idea under such circumstances must, then, amount to the expression of that particular phase of the idea which especially interests the hearer.

In extant Latin literature we find frequent use made of such expressions at the beginnings of new scenes in comedy, where the purpose is at once to sum up a conversation which has just been carried on off the stage, and to show the speaker's attitude toward the subject of this conversation. So in the *Adelphi* of Terence (ll. 447-9), when several new characters come upon the stage with the following conversation:

<i>Hegio.</i>	Pro di immortales, facinus indignum, Geta,	
	quod narras!	
<i>Geta.</i>		Sic est factum.
<i>Hegio.</i>		Ex illan familia
	tam inliberale esse ortum facinus!	

As this case and many others like it show, the natural mode of expression in Latin for this, the second stage of assimilation, is the infinitive—what the grammars call an infinitive exclamation of surprise or incredulity.

Not all infinitives of exclamation fall under this head, however, for besides expressing the speaker's attitude toward statements of other people, this construction may also, and often does, express his attitude toward ideas which have come to him in other ways—from his own observation, experience, or past thinking. These observations and experiences of the speaker's own are often found by him to be just as difficult of assimilation as the things which are said by another. So in Terence's *Andria*, 870, when Simo exclaims over the waywardness of his son:

Tantum laborem capere ob talem filium!

So far as the speaker himself is concerned, this independent use of the infinitive in a case of his own observation or experience is not different from its use with reference to an idea originally expressed by another person. In the latter case the speaker's sense of the original ownership or authorship of the idea has simply faded out, while in the former case such a sense of authorship never existed, and in both cases that phase of the idea which particularly interests the speaker and receives his whole attention, seems at the time utterly impossible of comprehension. Hence the surprise or incredulity.

Still a third independent infinitive which may be mentioned in this connection, is the so-called historical infinitive, what Professor Lane called the "infinitive of intimation." This infinitive is used especially in narrating a series of events which all crowd before the speaker's mind at once, or succeed each other so rapidly that he does not have time to get the individual ideas all completely under his control. In the case of the exclamatory infinitive we saw that the individual idea was not made the speaker's own, because of its incompatibility with his existing state of mind. In the case of the infinitive of intimation the *series* of ideas is not thoroughly made his own, because of their rapid succession, or their great number or diversity of character. Psychologically, therefore, the ideas expressed by the infinitive of intimation exist in the speaker's mind in the same state as those other ideas, proceeding either from the statements of other persons or from his own experience, which he has not been able to absorb completely, that is, these ideas are all in a state of incomplete association or assimilation. And this incomplete assimilation in B's mind of the idea expressed by A, is exactly the condition of the idea which is reflected in indirect discourse.

If we examine our mental habits, we find that we do not by any means always completely absorb the ideas we hear expressed. We all maintain a certain standard in the amount of corroborative evidence which we require of our own minds, before we will allow ourselves to decide whether that which someone else has said is true or false, whether we shall ourselves accept it as our own or reject it. As a matter of fact, in the case of very many

things that we hear, this standard is never reached at all, and cannot be reached, simply because it is not possible for us either to have or to get the experience and knowledge with regard to the idea, which is necessary for a positive judgment of our own. To be sure, the general credibility of the person speaking may, even in such cases, decide in his favor, and may get us to state as a truth, from our own standpoint, what, strictly speaking, is a truth only from his standpoint. But when this happens, we simply say, "The thing is so," not, "He says it is so," and there is no indirect discourse. We must therefore exclude this possibility from our discussion. We have at present to do only with those cases where B does not feel competent to pass final judgment on what A has said, and must therefore leave the idea to rest upon its own merits as an abstract proposition, or upon the authority of the original speaker. And an idea in this state, after the hearer's mind has been at work with it for a time, and his consciousness of its connection with the original speaker has become somewhat faint, is in Latin expressed, as we saw, by the infinitive.

Having now considered the second and third stages, we shall pass on to consider the first stage in the process of assimilation. At this stage, as we saw, the hearer's attention has not yet been completely transferred from the speaker himself to the idea he has expressed, and the personality of A and the sense of his authorship are therefore still very strong and vivid in B's mind. The difference between this stage and the second, or infinitive stage, which we have just spoken about, is that in this first stage the mind of B has not yet had time to busy itself with the idea. That being so, we should expect that B's expression, uttered as it is directly after that of A, would present the idea to us in practically the same form in which it was expressed by A. And this we find to be actually the case, with the exception, in Latin, that the verb is very often in the subjunctive, even when A used the imperative or the indicative. For example, after an imperative:

Most. 633. *Tranio*. Dic te daturum ut abeat. *Theopropides*. Egon dicam dare?

Capt. 139. *Hegio*. Ne fle. *Ergasilus*. Egon illum non fleam?

After an indicative question :

Ad. 374. *Syrus*. Quid agitur? *Demea*. Quid agatur?

Ad. 84. *Micio*. Quid is fecit? *Demea*. Quid ille fecerit?

After an indicative statement :

Andria 915. *Chremes*. Bonus est hic vir. *Simo*. Hic vir sit bonus?

Curc. 615. *Phaedromus*. Virgo haec liberast. *Therapontigonus*. Mean ancilla libera ut sit?

There is really nothing in this class of constructions that requires explanation except the subjunctive. But why should an idea expressed by A in the indicative have the subjunctive when it is expressed by B? From the examples given it is clear that the change in mood is not due to what A says or the way in which he says it, but that it must be due to something in the state of B's mind when he hears it, or in other words, to the effect produced upon B by the mere fact of A's utterance. For, as we saw, B uses the subjunctive in his retort exactly in the same way, whether A's original expression was a statement, a question, or a command. If we examine these three cases individually, we can readily understand why an imperative should change to a subjunctive. For when A gives a command to B, the latter would naturally, upon applying it to himself, *i. e.*, the first person, express it by the subjunctive, for in the first and third person the subjunctive regularly performs the same functions that the imperative performs in the second person. But why B should also use the subjunctive to express his mind upon hearing statements and questions that are put by A in the indicative, is not so easy to see.

In looking for the explanation of this peculiar phenomenon, we need to realize that it is in no sense an exceptional, but rather a thoroughly universal state of affairs with which we have to deal. For we find this exchange of mood in indirect discourse in Greek and the Germanic languages, no less than in Latin. We are fully justified in asserting, therefore, that the change is due to a general cause operating in all cases alike, or in other words, that there must be some common, fundamental, universal characteristic of the hearer's state of mind in this earliest stage

of the process of assimilation, which has led him to express himself in the same way, whether it be a statement that he hears, or a command, or a question, whether it be an indicative, a subjunctive, or an imperative. But what is this pervading quality of the hearer's consciousness, and what force of the subjunctive — or optative — is it that makes this mood his natural medium of expression?

We saw at the beginning of our discussion that an idea expressed by A has either been previously present in the mind of B, or it has not been present. In case it has been present, the only activity aroused in B's mind by A's utterance is the simple recognition of the idea, which is already in his possession. In this case we saw that indirect discourse was impossible. On the other hand, when A's idea is new to B, then a more or less lengthy process of assimilation is necessary in B's mind. And we found that it is during the earlier, or preliminary stages of this process, while assimilation is yet incomplete, that indirect discourse has its origin. When the subjunctive is used, therefore, to express an idea in the first part of this state of incomplete assimilation, it must have that force which will reflect the peculiar characteristic which distinguishes the mental process of active assimilation from that of mere recognition. And this distinguishing characteristic is easy enough to detect. It is the much greater effort which the mind, consciously enough, puts forth to assimilate the strange idea. To the original speaker, in whose mind the idea is already assimilated, the necessity of this effort is of course not so apparent; but to B, who has the actual work of assimilation to do, the effort is just as real and necessary as though A had given a command to his mental activities, instead of merely making a statement or asking a question. Hence B, at least in this early stage, when the stress of mental work is greatest and the personal element is most prominent, both feels and expresses the foreign idea, as if it were a demand made upon his mental powers by A. The subjunctive would then be the same subjunctive as that by which B retorts in case of a command, *i. e.*, it is a variety of what we may call the *reflex volitive*. Commands, statements, and questions are all, in the

very earliest stage of assimilation, felt by B merely as commands, or at least as demands upon his assimilative powers. After this first shock, of course, as B's mind recovers its equilibrium and gradually gains control of the idea instead of being mastered by it, and as A's personality fades from it, with the transfer of B's attention to the thought, this feeling of subjection to A's behest also vanishes, and the second stage of the assimilative process, the infinitive stage, supersedes the first or subjunctive stage.

There are two lines of external evidence which may be offered in favor of this view, that a strange idea, though expressed in a statement, is conceived by the hearer as a projection of the speaker's mind and personality, *i. e.*, as a demand upon his own mind. The first of these proofs is furnished by certain peculiar uses of the Latin verb *volo*. *Volt* and *volunt*, for instance, which are the external symbols of a demand by a third person or persons, are also used as the regular mode of introducing the religious and philosophical opinions of such persons. This use of the word is found scores of times in Cicero's philosophical writings, for example (*De Nat. Deor.* I, 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 36; II, 64, 68, etc.) But in addition to philosophical views, *volo* does also, quite frequently, introduce ideas or statements of any kind, as for instance (*Cic. Pro Cael.* 21, 53), *Si tam familiaris erat Clodiae, quam tu esse vis*. In other words, a person's *saying* or *thinking* something is looked upon as though he *wished* or *wanted* something.

Still more decisive, perhaps, is the evidence furnished in German by the use of the verb *sollen*. This verb, the cognate of the English *shall*, expresses obligation, *i. e.*, the state brought about by a command or expression of will on the part of another. So "Er soll gehen" means "I or someone else wants him to go." But this same word is also regularly used as a sign of indirect discourse, to express the opinions or words of someone else which the speaker is not ready to adopt as his own. So "Er soll fünfzig Jahr alt sein," "He is said to be fifty years old." Still further, and this we must not neglect to estimate at its true value, the same verb *sollen* is also used to reject a statement by another, just as the subjunctive is used in Latin. So my statement, "Dies

ist der König," would be thrown back at me by the exclamation "Dies soll der König sein?" Finally, in German as in Latin, the subjunctive is used with exactly the same force to express the identical shades of meaning that have been expressed by these three uses of *sollen*, namely, command, reported statement, and rejected statement.

To sum up our whole discussion in a word, then, we have found that indirect discourse will arise spontaneously only while the foreign idea is in a state of incomplete assimilation. Of this period of mental activity preliminary to complete assimilation, the subjunctive in Latin expresses an earlier, and the infinitive a later stage.

JOHN J. SCHLICHER.

STATE NORMAL SCHOOL,
Terre Haute, Ind.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

THE problems of secondary education seem to be uppermost in the minds of those who are interested in a nation's educational, industrial, and commercial progress. Not many months since we noticed the movement in Germany, under the patronage and indeed the inspiration of the Emperor, to make the secondary schools conform more nearly to the needs of the national life with its changed and ever-changing ideals. The bill before the British Parliament at the present time is distinguished from its predecessors by the provision for a more accurate definition of secondary education, and for its better articulation with elementary education. The Council of the Teachers' Guild of England is now making an investigation into the right order and relation of subject-matter in secondary schools, and expects to make this the great subject for discussion at the meeting of the Education Section in connection with the British Association next autumn.

But specially interesting to us is the movement in France. The Chamber has just concluded a most interesting debate, conducted on a very high plane, concerning a bill providing for the reformation of certain phases of secondary education in that country. The Minister of Public Instruction and the Commission de l'Enseignement, after thorough investigation and mature consideration, submitted a plan by which the secondary schools might be made more direct and positive contributors to national progress. The movement toward free secondary education is seen in France in the proposal to lower the fees in connection with the *lycées* and to increase the number of *bourses*. As M. Ribot said in the course of the debate—"As to free secondary education, the ideal of a well organized society is not to give the same instruction to all, but to open a way to the highest studies for the brighter minds even in the poorest classes of students." The total number of hours given to class work and study is to be reduced to nine for pupils under sixteen years of age, to seven for those under twelve, and a lesson instead of lasting through a wearisome two hours is to be confined to one hour. These provisions seem to us to be rational and in keeping with modern educational thought. But the greatest of changes occur in the heart of the school—the plan of studies. As an indication of the reason for the changes and of the general tendency in higher education in France, an extract from the speech of M. Leygues may be cited:

The struggle among nations for existence is too severe; the competition that we have to meet from our rivals is too keen to permit the university to stand aloof. In a country like France, where the professional population represents 48 per cent. of the whole, where the commercial capital engaged in agriculture and industry exceeds two

hundred millions of francs, the university cannot content itself with preparing the young men entrusted to it for liberal careers alone; it must also prepare for active life, for action. We have already brought our universities into contact with the general life; they have come down from the Olympian regions in which they had too long moved. They lend their aid to industry, commerce, and agriculture. Who can complain? We have established a school of tanning at the University of Lyons, a school of brewing at Nancy, laboratories for chemistry as applied to dyeing, etc. The university has not lost prestige owing to these steps. It still cultivates pure science, but it cultivates practical science also, and it extends its field instead of diminishing it. It becomes a force more active and more rich in results.

In accordance with such an ideal we find the following changes made in the plan of study. Secondary education is co-ordinated with primary in such a way that it forms a sequel to a course of primary instruction having a normal duration of four years; its own duration is seven years divided into two parts, one of four years and one of three. In the first division the pupils have a choice between two sections. In section A, Latin is obligatory from the first year, and Greek is optional from the fourth year; in section B, there is neither Latin nor Greek; but emphasis is placed on French, science, drawing, etc. The course of study in this division is so organized as to form a complete whole, and is not used as a mere preparation for the next division. There will be many pupils whose circumstances will not allow them more than eight years of schooling, and the country owes it to these that they be as well equipped as possible for the life in the great outside world. In the second division there are four groups of principal courses from which the pupil may make his choice: (a) Latin and Greek; (b) Latin with a more widely developed study of languages; (c) Latin with a more thorough study of science; (d) languages and science without any Latin course.

There will be only one *baccalauréat* of secondary education and based on examination on one of the above-mentioned sections of the second division. All diplomas of *bachelier* confer the same rights. Should students desire not to proceed to the *baccalauréat*, but study applied science, they may after passing the examinations at the end of the first division attend for two years certain schools of applied science which the government proposes to develop or found in various parts of the country.

The striking features of this plan are the possibility of a student obtaining the *baccalauréat*, and so entering the universities and the professions without any knowledge of Latin; shortening of the course and the articulation with primary education; the reservation of Greek for the élite. Think of France allowing a youth to go through the *lycée* without Latin or Greek, and to go to the university to learn tanning or brewing!

GEORGE HERBERT LOCKE.

BOOK REVIEWS

Analytical Psychology. A Practical Manual by LIGHTNER WITMER. Boston and London: Ginn & Co., 1902.

VERY few recent books in philosophy or psychology appeal to a more definite need than this book or meet it more adequately. It is "a series of experiments which can be performed by untrained students," with little explanation on the part of a teacher, and without costly apparatus. As such it affords a most valuable supplement to any of the good text-books in psychology already in use. It may, of course, be used also as an independent manual and introductory manual, as the experiments cover such topics as apperception, attention, association, space-perception, and analysis of sensation (the last under three well conceived headings), and in that order. But I believe its largest usefulness will be found when employed by both teacher and student to reinforce, illustrate and make concrete the principles found in more theoretic works. I quote with hearty approval Dr. Witmer's words: "This manual can render no more gratifying service than that of diverting those who are destined to become teachers from an unwholesome subservience to psychological and pedagogical authorities toward a confident self-dependence upon their own powers of observation and reflection." And I add that the book is most admirably qualified to perform this task. It shows upon every page marks of adaptation to the teacher's and student's needs. Properly used in normal schools, I anticipate that it will become a most important adjunct to preparation for teaching. It strikes the happy mean between mere general theory and a complicated and minute experimentation which, not illustrating general principles, has little value for the teacher.

JOHN DEWEY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Homeric Society. By ALBERT G. KELLER, Ph.D. Longmans, Green & Co. 1902.

TEACHERS of any phase of Greek literature and history, as well as of Homer, will find Dr. Keller's *Homeric Society* an almost indispensable book. As a part of the teacher's general or culture equipment, it will be found all the more valuable because not prepared as a classical text-book, but as a chapter of sociology. To consider the material of the Homeric poems from this point of view can but enlarge the teacher's horizon and enrich his teaching. When the linguistic material of the school is employed more freely as also one mode of making acquaintance with typical epochs in the culture history of humanity, our language teaching will be greatly improved. Dr. Keller's treatment is thorough, and his method such as to yield interesting as well as correct results.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

- The Italian Renaissance in England. By Lewis Einstein. Size, 5×7 in.; pp. 420. Price, \$1.50. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- The Child Life Fifth Reader. By Etta Austin Blaisdell and Mary Frances Blaisdell. Size, 5×7 in.; pp. 272. Price 45 cents. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Shakespeare's Twelfth Night. Edited by Richard Grant White. Size, $4\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. 121. Price, 15 cents (paper). Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.
- A Dog of Flanders and the Nürnberg Stove. By Louise De La Ramè ("Ouida"). Size, $4\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. 116. Price, 15 cents (paper). Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.
- The Conqueror. By Gertrude Franklin Atherton. Size, $5 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. 546. Price, \$1.50. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Stephen Arnold Douglas. By William Garrott Brown. Size, $4 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. 141. Price, 50 cents. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.
- Little Leaders. By William Morton Payne. Size, $4\frac{1}{2} \times 7$ in.; pp. 278. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co.
- Editorial Echoes. By William Morton Payne. Size, $4\frac{1}{2} \times 7$ in.; pp. 301. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co.

MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE.

- Victor Hugo's Notre-Dame de Paris. Edited by John R. Wightman, Ph.D., Oberlin College. Size, $4\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. 419. Boston: Ginn & Co.
- Daudet's Tartarin de Tarascon. Edited by C. Fontaine. Size, 5×7 in.; pp. 145. Price, 45 cents. New York: American Book Co.
- Alphonse Daudet—Selected Stories. Edited by T. Atkinson Jenkins, Professor in Swarthmore College. Size, 5×7 in.; pp. 185. Price, 50 cents. New York: American Book Co.
- Monsieur Bergeret. By Anatole France. Edited by Francis Harold Dike, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Size, 5×7 in.; pp. 280. New York: Silver, Burdett & Co.
- Unter Brüdern. By Paul Heyse. Edited by Emil Keppler, Columbia University. Size, 5×7 in.; pp. 68. New York: Silver, Burdett & Co.
- Legenden. By Gottfried Keller. Edited by Margarete Müller and Carla Wenckebach, Wellesley College. Size, $4\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. 145. Price, 35 cents. New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- Der Talisman. By Ludwig Fulda. Edited by C. William Prettyman, Dickinson College. Size, $4\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. 125. Price, 35 cents. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
- Der Bibliothekar. By Gustav von Moser. Edited by William A. Cooper, Leland Stanford Junior University. Size, 5×7 in.; pp. 187. Price, 45 cents. New York: American Book Co.

Der Prozess. By Roderich Benedix, and Einer Musz Heiraten, by A. Wilhelm. Edited by M. B. Lambert. Size, 5×7 in.; pp. 112. Price, 30 cents. New York: American Book Co.

Das Spielmannskind und Der Stumme Ratsherr. By W. H. Kiehl. Edited by Geo. M. Priest, Princeton University. Size, 5×7 in.; pp. 134. New York: American Book Co.

ANCIENT AND MODERN HISTORY.

Lessons in Old Testament History. By A. S. Aglen. Size, 5×7 in.; pp. 456. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.; London: Edward Arnold, 37 Bedford Street, Strand.

A Short History of Germany. By Ernest F. Henderson. Two volumes. Size, $6 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ in.; Vol. I, pp. 517; Vol. II, pp. 471. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Town Life in Ancient Italy. By Ludwig Friedlander. Edited by William E. Waters, New York University. Size, $5 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. 62. Price, 75 cents. Boston: Benjamin H. Sanborn & Co.

PHILOSOPHY, MATHEMATICS, BOTANY.

Ten Common Trees. By Susan Stokes. Salt Lake City High School. Size, 5×7 in.; pp. 108. Price, 40 cents. New York: American Book Co.

Democracy and Social Ethics. By Jane Addams, Hull House, Chicago. Size, 5×7 in.; pp. 281. Price, \$1.25. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Four-Place Logarithmic Tables. By Percy F. Smith. Size, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. 29. Price, 50 cents. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

Outlines of Botany. By Robert Greenleaf Leavitt. Size, 5×8 in.; pp. 272. New York: American Book Co.

LITERATURE AND ART.

A History of Ancient Greek Literature. By Harold N. Fowler, Western Reserve University. Size, $5 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. 501. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Tuscan Sculpture of the Fifteenth Century. By Estelle M. Hurl. Size, 5×8 in.; pp. 97. Price, 50 cents. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

NOTES

THE SCHOOL REVIEW takes pleasure, at the request of Professor Rein of Jena, in announcing that women are now admitted as regular students to that university and to his own pedagogical seminary.

A Dog of Flanders and *The Nürnberg Stove*, two of the best of Ouida's wholesome stories for children, make up the latest issue (No. 150) of the "Riverside Literature Series."

Der Prozess, by Roderich Benedix, and *Einer Muss Heiraten*, by A. Wilhelmi. Edited by M. B. Lambert, Boys' High School, Brooklyn. Cloth, 12mo, 112 pp. Price, 30 cents. American Book Co., New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago. These two plays are among those recommended for elementary reading by the Modern Language Association of America. They are excellent examples of the brief comedy, replete with fun and sprightliness. They furnish practice in colloquial expressions, and will be of great help in teaching the idioms of the language. Exercises for retranslation, based on the text, afford materials for drill in German prose composition.

Moser's Der Bibliothekar. Edited, with notes and vocabulary, by William A. Cooper, A.M., assistant professor of German in the Leland Stanford Junior University. Cloth, 12mo, 187 pp. Price, 45 cents. American Book Co., New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago. The English version of this play, under its title of *The Private Secretary*, has won a host of friends in this country. There is no local coloring, and hence it is easy of comprehension by American pupils. Its genuine humor stimulates the student's interest in the text, and it has proved a favorite wherever used in schools. The language, while offering no great difficulties, gives an acquaintance with colloquial German which is most helpful.

Tuscan Sculpture, which Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. announce for publication in March, is Vol. XI of the "Riverside Art Series." The book gathers material for a survey of Tuscan sculpture, consisting of pictures of masterpieces and brief accounts of the artists. The famous old works—the "St. George" of Donatello, the "Madonna" of Luca della Robbia, and the "Bambino" of Adrea della Robbia are reproduced, and others, making in all sixteen pictures. To these Miss Hurlb has added brief biographical sketches of the artists, an essay on Tuscan sculpture of the fifteenth century, and a historical directory of the works in this collection.

The publishers will receive subscriptions to any four consecutive issues of the school edition in paper binding at \$1.25, and in cloth binding at \$1.80.

The energetic secretary of the National Educational Association has issued the following statistics of membership enrollment at meeting of the Department of Superintendence, National Educational Association, Chicago, Ill., February 25-27, 1902.

	Former Active.	New Active.	Total Active.	Associate.	Total Membership.
Total.....	580	92	672	182	854
North Atlantic.....	103	19	122	93	145
South Atlantic.....	11	3	14	3	17
South Central.....	18	6	24	8	32
North Central.....	427	57	484	144	628
Western.....	21	7	28	4	32
NORTH ATLANTIC DIVISION—					
Maine.....	1	...	1	...	1
New Hampshire.....	...	1	1	...	1
Vermont.....	3	1	4	...	4
Massachusetts.....	24	9	33	7	33
Rhode Island.....	1	...	1	...	1
Connecticut.....	5	...	5	...	5
New York.....	50	12	62	14	76
New Jersey.....	8	2	10	1	11
Pennsylvania.....	11	1	12	1	13
SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION—					
Delaware.....	1
Maryland.....	1	...	1	...	1
District of Columbia.....	1	...	1	...	1
Virginia.....	1	...	1	...	1
West Virginia.....	1	2	3	2	5
North Carolina.....
South Carolina.....
Georgia.....	7	1	8	...	8
Florida.....
SOUTH CENTRAL DIVISION—					
Kentucky.....	4	1	5	2	7
Tennessee.....	2	...	2	1	3
Alabama.....	4	4	8	4	12
Mississippi.....	1	...	1	...	1
Louisiana.....	2	...	2	...	2
Texas.....	1	...	1	1	2
Arkansas.....	4	...	4	...	4
Oklahoma.....	...	1	1	...	1
Indian Territory.....
NORTH CENTRAL DIVISION—					
Ohio.....	48	3	51	15	66
Indiana.....	49	9	58	14	72
Illinois.....	166	17	183	46	229
Michigan.....	42	7	49	16	65
Wisconsin.....	28	6	34	8	42
Iowa.....	28	6	34	12	46
Minnesota.....	27	3	30	6	36
Missouri.....	11	2	13	10	23
North Dakota.....	1	...	1	...	1
South Dakota.....	4	...	4	...	4
Nebraska.....	12	4	16	14	30
Kansas.....	11	...	11	3	14
WESTERN DIVISION—					
Montana.....	2	...	2	...	2
Wyoming.....	2	...	2	...	2
Colorado.....	13	2	15	2	17
New Mexico.....	1	...	1	...	1
Arizona.....
Utah.....	...	4	4	...	4
Nevada.....
Idaho.....
Washington.....	2	1	3	2	5
Oregon.....
California.....	1	...	1	...	1

